The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXXIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 1924 NUMBER 501

Contents

The Week 167

Editorials

The Democrats in Conflict 171
Democratic Economics, 1924 173
The Middle-Aged Woman 174

General Articles

The Democracy Fumbles ..... Bruce Bliven 176
On the Line (Verse) ..... Leslie Nelson Jennings 178
De-Bunking Mr. Dawes ..... Donald R. Richberg 180
A Campaign Glossary ..... C. M. 183
The War on the Peace Seekers ..... Leonard Cline 184
The Bandwagon 186

Correspondence 186

Reviews of Books

More Modern Art ..... Lewis Mumford 188
Samuel Pepys ..... Robert Morss Lovett 189
Birds, Beasts and Flowers ..... Louise Bogan 190
Some Recent Novels 191

The Week

AS we go to press, the Democratic party in national convention assembled has made one failure and seems in grave danger of making another. A platform has been adopted which is a political catch-all. It is firm and decisive only on issues concerning which there is no internal strife within the party, and of these there are very few. On almost everything else it straddles or evades or murmurs sweet nothings. Such a platform in the year 1924 seems to us a grave political error. It represents that expediency which, as Rabbi Stephen Wise pointed out in an address before the convention, "is never expedient." Having adopted a compromise platform, the party seems altogether likely to go on to commit a second error and choose a compromise candidate, a man who is a little of everything, but not much of anything. If the Democracy were trying to make sure that Senator LaFollette would take the field independently, hoping that he would do the Republicans more harm than he would do to itself, it could hardly have acted more directly to achieve that result.

THE platform, as might be expected of such a timid document, is of huge length. Its best feature is its denunciation of the corruption at Washington during the present Republican régime and its pledge to turn the rascals out. It attacks the Mellon plan and such proposals as the sales tax, affirms its allegiance to the income tax and declares that the burden on the taxpayer is in general too high. For the relief of agricultural distress it promises a foreign policy which will restore the export market, and a reduction in the tariff which will put the farmers' purchasing power on a parity with that of industrial regions. It also promises decreased freight rates by rail and water, encouragement for coöperative marketing and, in vague terms which hint at the McNary-Haugen bill, the creation of an export corporation or commission to get rid of the exportable surplus and prevent its price from setting that of the whole crop.

ON the Esch-Cummins law the platform contents itself by saying that it must be rewritten. It demands capacity production at Muscle Shoals without committing itself for or against government ownership or the Ford offer. It does declare, however, that the nation should retain the title to all its water power. It asks for the abolition of "lame duck" congresses, for popular vote on constitutional amendments, for the conscription of capital in case of war, and that war shall not be declared without a popular vote except in case of actual or threatened invasion. It urges international reduction of armament, and joint agreement among the nations for ultimate world disarmament. It condemns the Lausanne Treaty, endorses immediate independence for the Philippines, recommends adequate salaries for postal employes, proposes publicity for campaign contributions, and on the question of prohibition demands "law enforcement." It suggests that public works should be constructed during periods of unemployment; and while recommending private ownership of the merchant marine, advises that the government should continue to own and operate sufficient vessels to insure the maintenance of this service.

THE plank in regard to the League of Nations which was finally adopted was, of course, a direct repudiation of previous Democratic policy and of the Wilsonian attitude. While the acceptance of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the referendum proposal was in part a victory for McAdoo, in whose camp it originated, other motives undoubtedly entered into the delegates' action. They believed, and no doubt correctly, that this year's campaign is certain to be fought on domestic issues. They also believe that advocacy of the League is still an enormous political liability. A telling argument was found in the contention that many thousands of Republicans would vote in favor of the League at a special referendum who would stick to their party if the issue were put up in a Presidential year. The delegates evidently were little troubled by Mr. Baker's arguments that the proposed referendum would be illegal, unconstitutional, a violation of states' rights, and might delay rather than hasten American entrance into the League.

THE fight over the Ku Klux Klan was of a far more serious character. To all appearances it presented a real danger of splitting the party; and it may yet have a serious effect on the chance of victory. The resolution which condemned the Klan by name, and was lost by 4.3 votes out of 1,098, actually represented the wishes of a good-sized majority of the delegates. Not only were irregularities claimed in the votes of the Georgia, Philippine and Canal Zone delegations, which were more than sufficient to reverse the result, but in some other delegations a minority wished to vote against the Klan and could not because of the undemocratic and archaic unit rule which forced the whole delegation to vote one way. We wish we could add that all the opponents of the Klan objected to it solely on the ground of its unfairness, its deliberate policy of political and economic discrimination against an individual because of race or religion and irrespective of personal qualifications. Such, however, is not the case. While there were honorable men and women who took this viewpoint, there were obviously many others who saw the matter in no other terms than as a religious war, and lined up on one side or the other according to their own individual faiths.

THOSE who are impatient with M. Herriot because he moves slowly toward a settlement overlook the extreme delicacy and difficulty of his position. The policy of Poincaré was relatively simple. The Germans were down, and with sufficient vigilance and ruthlessness on the part of France, Germany could be kept down and France remain safe. Herriot's policy would let Germany rise to her feet. She will rise not only with the bitterness of defeat in her heart, but with an infinite number of just grievances for the way France has treated her since the Armistice. Individuals may compose a quarrel and let bygones be bygones. Peoples cannot do so. Too many persons carry irremediable injuries with them through life. Accordingly Herriot cannot act on a humanitarian impulse, but must wait until he finds some substitute for Poincaré's club over Germany. A mutual insurance under the League of Nations might serve the purpose. In spite of his denial of responsibility for the statements published in the Norman Angell interview, this is plainly the solution toward which he leans.

"I AM for economy," declares President Coolidge. "After that I am for more economy." The words sound sweet in the ears of the taxpayers. But there is an old distinction between true economy and false. True economy attends not only to the elimination of waste, but also to the application of resources where they may be expected to yield commensurate results. False economy thinks of nothing but clamping down the lid on expenditures. It sits in stony indifference while valuable opportunities are missed for want of the application of modest outlays. Which kind of economy is President Coolidge's? "The duty and the opportunity of the government today is not to enter upon new fields of enterprise." There you have it. No question is raised as to the value of new fields of enterprise. It would indeed be the duty of the government to keep out of new undertakings if we were in fact hard up as a nation. We are not. On the President's own showing we shall have a surplus of $25,000,000 after assigning nearly half a billion to sinking the public debt. Moreover, the $25,000,000 is one of those underestimates for which Mellon is famous. More probably the surplus will exceed $75,000,000. In view of this situation it may properly be asked why we should starve many of the more useful branches of the public service—as we certainly shall—to realize the President's dream of a further saving of $83,000,000.

THOSE who profess themselves dissatisfied with the results of the Walsh Committee's investigation will now have the opportunity for which they have been longing, to have the same ground gone over in a court of law. A Federal Grand Jury in the District of Columbia has indicted former Secretary Fall, Harry Sinclair, and the Dohenys, father and son, on various charges centreing about accusations of conspiracy and bribery. That such indictments would be returned has been, of course, a foregone conclusion; the most striking fact about them has been the seemingly unnecessary delay in taking action so obviously required. Cynics will find some food for thought in noting that the jury action was made public during the Democratic National Convention, just after the adoption of a platform which denounced the Republicans for failure to prosecute; and that among newspapermen in attendance at the convention the rumor was circulated ten days earlier that indictments would be announced before the sessions were over. For our part we reject the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

notion that there was any connection between the events other than that of pure coincidence; and we wait with interest the developments of the trial.

PREMIER HERRIOT'S orders permitting the Germans expelled from the Rhineland and the Ruhr to return to their homes and suspending the sentences of Germans condemned for taking part, without violence, in passive resistance may not have any immediate effect on the relations between Paris and Berlin, but it is bound to have a considerable effect on the relations between the French and German peoples. The expulsion of these Germans, in a vast majority of cases, was a grievous wrong, inflicted by the Poincaré government with the deliberate intention of exasperating the German people. The restoration of the exiles to their homes does not right the wrong, but it exculpates Herriot and the French democracy. The reactionary German press naturally denies Herriot the least credit for these acts of humanity and common sense. They are no more desirous of seeing a spirit of mutual toleration growing up between the two peoples than Poincaré himself.

APPARENTLY German Nationalist opposition to the Dawes plan is weakening. The plan is no more popular with the Junkers, but it begins to look dangerous to the Nationalist party to assume responsibility for its rejection. The condition of German industry demands the early establishment of some sort of international modus vivendi. The currency is stable for the time, but the credit structure based on it is extremely shaky. Any political party which undertook at this time to renew the struggle with France would load upon itself the blame for closing down factories, producing unemployment and provoking civil disorder. It would fare badly in the elections that are bound to follow a deadlock on the Dawes plan. The Nationalists hate the French, but they dare not stake their party fortunes on their hatred. They opposed the renewal of Allied military control, but this opposition did not exhibit the spirit that might have been anticipated. The present is no time for a policy of blood and iron, and the Junkers know it.

EXACTLY what negotiations are going on between Japan and Soviet Russia it is impossible at this time to say. It has been intimated that Japan is offering to drop her claims arising out of the "Nikolaevsk massacre" in return for certain concessions in Siberia. There are also intimations that military relations between the two powers are under discussion. Neither seems to us to offer a sufficient basis for negotiations. Soviet Russia will never concede anything on account of that alleged massacre at Nikolaevsk, especially when the initiative is taken by Japan, not by herself. The probabilities are that Japan, having good reason for thinking that the Herriot government will compose French differences with Russia, prefers not to be left holding the sack along with the United States. There is some trade to be had in Siberia, and Japan needs it. If she can get concessions in return for recognition, of course, she will take them. If not, she will probably soon grant recognition gratis. Naturally private individuals in Japan expect their government to extort important financial concessions. Hence the recent wild speculations in Tsarist rubles. There seems little basis, however, for such expectations.

GENERAL DAWES is now learning some of the trials and tribulations of a candidate for national office. Since he has been nominated for Vice-President, his opponents have been looking up his record and have reminded the country that he is a bitter opponent of union labor, having sought to commit the Republican party to an open shop platform in 1920. Elsewhere in this issue of the New Republic Donald Richberg tells the story of Mr. Dawes's connection with the notorious Lorimer bank affair, wherein the Dawes institution furnished to Lorimer $1,250,000 which the latter falsely presented to the bank examiners as part of his own assets. As this issue of the New Republic is on the press, a special despatch to the New York World records the final chapter in this story. After a ten-year legal battle, the courts have ruled that the Dawes bank must pay to the receivers for the Lorimer institution $165,000 because of its share in the transaction. Appeals for rehearing by both sides have been denied and the case appears to have been closed. As if this were not trouble enough, Attorney-General Stone in filing suit against the participants in the alleged gasoline monopoly has named the Pure Oil Company as a secondary defendant. This is an organization in which members of the Dawes family are heavily interested, B. G. Dawes, brother of the candidate, being its president. The inventor of "Hell and Maria" may well consider himself entitled to observe that "the way of the candidate is hard."

ON numerous occasions in the past the New Republic has commented on the bitterness of that class warfare along the Pacific coast which has resulted in numerous acts of cruel injustice, including sending scores of men to prison, not because they have committed any crime, but for being members of the Industrial Workers of the World. A short time ago an incident took place which is characteristic of many similar ones. At San Pedro, California, the I. W. W. were giving an entertainment in their hall. A group of men, some of whom were dressed as sailors, broke in, assaulted numerous men, women and children, smashed all the furniture, including a piano, typewriters, etc., and kidnaped nine men. These, most of whom were bleeding from scalp wounds, were taken thirty miles in a truck to a lonely canyon, robbed of all their valuables,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and tarred and feathered. That the outrage was possible without police action was due to the fact that Captain Hagenbaugh of the local force had sent all his men to a remote part of the harbor on a riot call—a feat for which he was sharply reprimanded by Chief Vollmer, his superior officer. The I. W. W. and the United States naval officers unite in asserting that the sailors' uniforms were a disguise and that the men who took part in the affair were all civilians. In an endeavor to justify an inexcusable incident a cock-and-bull story has been spread to the effect that the I. W. W. were plotting to blow up the morgue where lay the bodies of the Mississippi explosion victims! No such ridiculous explanation is necessary. The outrage is similar to many others which have occurred in the past and probably will occur in the future; and there is good reason to believe that the participants in it could easily have been members of Southern California's "best families," who believe that they are engaged in a holy war to make the world safe for private property.

A LAW case which may have the gravest effect upon the history of the British Empire was recently concluded in London where a jury gave Sir Michael O'Dwyer £500 in a libel case against Sir Sankaran Nair. Sir Michael was civil governor of the Punjab in 1919 at the time of the infamous Amritsar massacre, when Brigadier-General Dyer ordered an unarmed native crowd fired upon, with the result that four hundred persons were killed and twelve hundred more were wounded. This cold-blooded massacre proved the most memorable event in the history of India since that attempted revolution which the British have always, characteristically, termed "the Mutiny." It was a chief factor in increasing the political strength of the Swaraj party. The action of General Dyer was bitterly criticized in India and in England and official inquiries decided that it was unjustified. The recent libel case was based on a book by Sir Sankaran Nair entitled Gandhi and Anarchy. Sir Sankaran, it is interesting to note, is not a disciple of Swaraj at all, but a former judge of the Madras High Court and member of the Viceroy's cabinet. His book was a bitter arraignment of Gandhism, but contained an incidental passage criticizing Sir Michael O'Dwyer's civil administration of the Punjab. The book was published in India, and only a few copies were sent privately to Great Britain. To conduct the libel trial in the latter country, therefore, thousands of miles from the home of all the witnesses, seems in itself a gross piece of injustice.

EVEN more unfair, according to the accounts of eye witnesses, was the attitude of Mr. Justice McCardie in conducting the case. From first to last he appears, as the New Statesman comments, to have "made no secret of his prejudice." His summing up was virtually a speech on behalf of the plaintiff; and he even went to the incredible length of saying that General Dyer "was wrongly punished by the Secretary of State for India." The jury was divided eleven to one; but the opposing counsel agreed to accept the majority verdict and decided upon the sum of £500 and costs. While Sir Sankaran has a technical right of appeal, the case has already cost him $60,000, and his experience in this instance is not such as to encourage him about securing justice in an English court.

BRITISH liberals, naturally, are gravely concerned as to the effect the case will have upon the already inflamed state of opinion in India. "The ruler may be personally vindicated," observes the Nation (London), "but what of the broadcasting of the authoritative accounts of the methods employed in the Punjab during two years of wartime rule, with and without the assistance of martial law?" The Nation adds:

> British officers of standing, civil and military, described the system of "compulsory voluntarism" in recruiting, the enforced salaaming by Indians, the public floggings, the crawling order, the wholesale jailing of Indian intelligentsia, the extraordinary expedient of keeping students on the march in the heat of a Punjab April for sixteen miles a day. The court heard again, the frank admission of British officers as to the need of teaching the people a lesson they could not forget, by means of wholesale shooting and of bombs from the air; it heard General Beynon's opinion that flogging is an appropriate penalty for Indians and it heard from Colonel Frank Johnson, who was in military command at Lahore, a terrible affirmation upon the lengths to which he was prepared to go for the maintenance of the British Raj.

A NEW and altogether desirable magazine has just made its first appearance: Music, an Illustrated Monthly Review. It is edited by Deems Taylor and Gilbert Gabriel aided by a supporting group of writers and musicians of such distinction that to select a name or two for casual mention is impossible. The initial number is decidedly attractive both in material and make-up. But most attractive is the policy it announces and proceeds to illustrate. "Somewhere," say the editors, "between the service offerings of student-teacher-trade papers and the aristocratic Brahminism of learned cryptograms exists an emptiness which a non-technical (though authoritative), good humored, entertaining magazine about music and musicians can and should fill." This seems to mean that the paper is to be filled neither with hints for beginners nor with puffs of concertizing artists, but is to discuss serious music for the intelligent layman. If that is it we heartily applaud, and hope that Music may live to fill the emptiness robustly.

THE latest advices from the American front to the red International now in session at Moscow have it that there is no revolution and no revolutionary

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mass party in the United States today. The bearer of these tidings should know: he is the premature communist, William Dunn, who was expelled from the A. F. of L. convention last fall. If his report needs corroboration, that could no doubt be furnished by our premature white guard: Palmer, Burleson, Doherty and Burns. But Dunn's report is not altogether discouraging to the crimson cause. The thing may yet come off, indeed will, "when the Gompers organization is captured (by radicals) and the 12,000,000 Negroes in America are stirred up." Judge Gary and the Ku Klux Klan please notice.

THE charge is now being made that the expression "Separation of Church and State," which appears in the Klan plank finally adopted by the Democratic convention, is in reality a code signal transcribed from a Klan oath and intended to rally Klansmen to the Democratic party. Here is a clear demonstration of the poisonous nature of secret political organizations. Assume that the charge cannot, in the nature of the case, be proved and that it will be vigorously denied; neither can it be disproved. Since the oaths, deliberations and even membership of the Klan are secret, people who are prejudiced against it will believe the worst and their beliefs cannot be refuted. So long as the Klan exists everybody that does not oppose it outright and vigorously will be suspected.

THE first industrial unemployment insurance ever issued in the State of New York has been provided for in the agreement just signed by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the New York Clothing Manufacturers' Exchange. This is a significant achievement because it is more than a mere matter of insurance: it is a step toward the reorganization of a chaotic industry. Clothing manufacture has always been a highly seasonal occupation featured by hectic activity part of the year and complete cessation in the off season. This system necessarily works great hardships on all concerned, and Mr. Sidney Hillman, who as president of the Amalgamated has continually emphasized the good of the industry as a whole as his chief objective, has set himself to modify it. The establishment of unemployment insurance is a step in that direction. The object is not simply to provide a dole; it is rather a general recognition of responsibility for bringing the seasonal lay-off to an end.

THE school for explorers which has been established by the American Geographical Society of New York is doubtless not intended to produce discoverers synthetically. The traveller in parts unknown must necessarily possess certain human qualities that are not induced by laboratory practice with compass and transit. He must be as intrepid as Tartarin and as ingenious as Traprock. In short, explorers are born, not educated into existence. Nevertheless, it will hardly do the prospective wanderer any harm to take a course in the technique of jungle navigation and desert mapping. It might even be a good thing if this training were given to all missionaries and others whose incidental travels could thus be turned to excellent account for science.

The Democrats in Conflict

THE Democratic party may leave much to be desired at once in its traditions, its composition and in its attitude towards public affairs, but at the present moment it is showing an amount of sheer political vitality which by comparison makes the Republican party look like a neurotic recluse. Its national convention is really deliberating though in an absurd, clumsy, noisy, extravagant way. It is confronted by a number of serious differences of opinion as to the definition of comparative issues and as to the merit of its proposed candidates. It is fighting out these conflicts of interests, conviction and outlook frankly and fearlessly. The party membership seems to be honestly trying to find out by discussion, friction, vociferation and hullabaloo what the party as a whole really wants in the way of leadership and principle.

The contrast with the performance of the Republican party in Cleveland is striking. The Republicans, as we pointed out at the time, did not dare to allow any frank public discussion of issues or conflict of opinion. They were divided by even sharper differences of interest and outlook than the Democrats, but with the exception of the uncontrollable insurrection of the La Follette group, which they discounted in advance, they were determined, so far as possible, to keep these differences submerged. They feared that, if the acrimony and irritation of a public discussion were not avoided, they might be shown up to the public as they really were, viz., as a political body which proposed to govern the nation in spite of its inability to govern itself. They were so muddled and disconcerted that the only way to avoid disintegration and utter exposure was to take their decisions furtively and to give and to obey orders silently.

The proceedings of the convention demonstrated the necessity of such precautions. There was, for instance, a group of Republican delegates who objected sharply to the utterances of the platform in favor of the World Court, and wished to express their dissent, but they were denied the opportunity of doing so on the floor of the convention. These repressed explosions of conviction and the more subtle repression which followed from the evasion in the platform of any decisive pronouncement upon the more important issues of the day resulted in irritating in one way or another almost all the leaders and delegates; and the irritation expressed itself in trivial and unreasonable ways. Whenever

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the dictatorship ceased to function in relation to important decisions, as in the case of the nomination for the Vice-Presidency, the convention peevishly committed every possible mistake both in tactics and in decisions. Being afraid to fight one another in the open the friction among the leaders degenerated into petty quarrelling which has continued since the adjournment of the convention. The party does not know at present whether it is being governed by a dictator or by a conference. If Mr. Butler is a dictator he is dictating to a body of the faithful who openly or secretly flout his authority. If he is not a dictator and the party is really being operated by a committee, it is a committee whose conferences will result mostly, not in adjustments and decisions, but in misunderstandings and disputes.

The Democrats are confronted, of course, by a number of extremely serious issues, concerning both principles and personalities, about which they differ not only sharply but even dangerously. Most important of all there is the issue of racial and religious toleration which is raised by the activities of the Ku Klux Klan within the party and by the candidacy of Governor Smith. The Klan issue is less serious for the Republicans than for the Democrats. Yet while the former evaded it, the latter are laboring to get a frank expression of opinion about it without disrupting the party. Even though they do not succeed very well, the frank ventilation of the issue will have educated their own membership to understand how impossible the Klan is and how fatal it would be to consent to its domination of the party. In relation to prohibition the Democrats have the advantage of accepting or rejecting a candidate who is frankly wet in that he stands for a revision of the Volstead Act, whereas the Republicans, if their candidate is reëlected, will not be committed either to the repeal or the more sincere enforcement of the statute. The Democrats are likely also to deal in a more fundamental way with the issue which is raised by American participation in European affairs. Their platform utterance about American adherence to the League of Nations will involve losses, no matter whether they declare for or against the policy of 1920, but in either event they will have taken a decision which will mean something positive for the future development of the party. The same remark applies to the choice which they are trying to make between the two candidates who polled the largest number of delegates on the first ballot. Both McAdoo and Smith have certain clear advantages and defects as the party candidate, and neither could or should have been nominated without a struggle. The struggles, as they have been conducted, are an evidence of Democratic vitality.

It is worth while to insist on this aspect of the deliberations and decisions of the party, because the psychological importance of allowing conflicts to get themselves expressed is frequently overlooked. Necessary as a disposition towards adjustment and conciliation is in politics, the adjustments should not take place until all the parties to the dispute have had their day in court and been granted every opportunity to relieve their minds. The Klan is, for instance, a maleficent organization which the Democratic party would do well to repudiate, but the repudiation if and when it occurs, should be reached after a public row in which both sides can shout their shibboleths and shriek their defiances. After they have obtained this release they are much more likely to subside and submit to a defeat or even consent to an agreement than if the issue had been evaded or one party or the other had won a victory by default. The Republicans who were not allowed to express themselves on the floor of the convention about the World Court will as a consequence of their irritation be more, rather than less, disposed to make their opposition irreconcilable when the project comes up again for ratification by the Senate. On the other hand the Klan, like so many evil things, can thrive only as a consequence of partial obscurity and evasion. It cannot submit to a frank discussion of its purposes and methods without causing its members to waver in their allegiance to its symbols and leaders. The public discussion, acrimonious though it be and unsuccessful in promoting immediate agreement, is indispensable to the mixture of elucidation and emotional purging without which the ghosts created by our popular fears and rancors cannot be laid.

The Democratic party may or may not win at the coming election, but its recent behavior proves it to be the kind of party which is still capable of assuming the moral responsibility of government. Its way of doing things is wholesome. Those who comment on party politics, which is so much concerned with immediate success, are naturally disposed to emphasize the promptness or the unanimity of a decision rather than the soundness of the process whereby the decision is reached. But when a decision is reached by refusing to allow public discussion, by evading or violently suppressing serious obstacles, by subterfuge and manipulation, or by any other method which cheapens its quality and the quality of men who do the deciding, it will prove to be an ultimately demoralizing and unsuccessful decision. The Republicans achieved the nominations of both Harding and Coolidge with far less stress, conflict and hullabaloo than the Democratic party is now exhibiting in selecting its candidate, but their comparatively easy success was not an evidence of moral good faith and mutual confidence and respect among the members and divisions of the party. On the contrary both nominations were achieved by side-stepping, suppressing or ignoring deep-lying differences of interest and outlook which in the event of future success were bound to reappear in far more malignant form. These differences pursued poor Mr. Harding and their dogged ability to make trouble had much to do with his death.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Their successors will pursue Mr. Coolidge in the event of his reëlection even more relentlessly and disastrously. Their suppression during the convention and campaign will recruit their struggle for renewed activity just as soon as the victory is won. On the other hand the Democrats in the event of victory would already have fought out many of their lasting disagreements and will be the better prepared for administrative and legislative action. They have, to be sure, failed to take sufficient interest in economic issues, and their stupidity in this respect will expose a possible Democratic administration to a repetition of the bankruptcy of the Republicans as economic reformers; but at any rate the Democrats, as compared to their competitors, are adopting the right method of keeping their party alive as an able, moral, and political agent.

Democratic Economics, 1924

THE Democratic party runs true to form in its platform pronouncements on economics. It is opposed to special privilege. It condemns private monopoly, without qualification. It regards the protective tariff as an instrument of predation. These are time-honored doctrines, worth reaffirming, no doubt. But the voter is interested in the concrete proposals directed against special privilege and monopoly, or aimed at giving reality to the conception of equal rights to all. Exactly what does the Democratic party promise to do?

In the matter of the tariff it declares itself in favor of a tax "that will promote effective competition, protect against monopoly and at the same time produce a fair revenue." We take it that this means a substantial reduction in duties, a reform sorely needed. The platform affirms the faith of the party in the graduated income tax, frankly accepting it as a tax on wealth. It avoids the question of inheritance or estate taxes, as well as excess profits taxation.

To the farmer the platform promises, in addition to a tariff that will enable him to buy supplies at lower prices, a reduction in rail and water transportation rates, the completion of our internal waterways system, the use of our waterpower for the production of cheap fertilizers, the encouragement of coöperative marketing associations and the establishment of an export marketing corporation or commission "in order that the exportable surplus may not establish the price of the whole crop." This last proposal, if it means anything, means the acceptance of the principle of the McNary-Haugen bill, which the Democrats helped to vote down in the last session.

To the laborer the platform offers increase in wages of postal employes, and a modification of the labor clauses of the Esch-Cummins bill. It favors collective bargaining and laws regulating hours and conditions of labor. It accepts the principle that public works should be undertaken in time of slack employment. It indirectly endorses the Child Labor amendment by claiming credit for its passage through Congress.

Other economic planks pledge the party to conservation of natural resources, to an active reclamation policy, to the retention by the nation of title to its water power and the administration of the Federal Reserve system so as "to give stability to industry, commerce and finance."

No one will deny that many of these proposals have a progressive sound. But the voter may properly ask how it is proposed to realize these excellent objects. Does the national Democratic party recommend to the states that they proceed at the earliest possible date to the ratification of the Child Labor amendment? No. The party "favors" collective bargaining. How does it propose to make its favor count? By urging a curb upon the issue of injunctions in labor disputes? Not at all. Does it recommend to the states that they enact measures to prevent the making of labor contracts forbidding men to join unions? No. The Democratic platform favors laws governing hours and conditions of labor. Within the jurisdiction of the federal government, or beyond its jurisdiction, in the states? The platform does not specify.

Title to the nation's water power should be retained by the nation. Good. But does this mean that the water powers are to be developed as a public enterprise, and power delivered directly to the consumer? The platform is non-committal on this point. It demands prompt action by Congress for the operation of Muscle Shoals plants in the production of commercial fertilizers. Does this demand suggest that the party is really alive to the question of power, soon to become the chief economic question before the American people? Certainly not.

"Railroad freight rates should be so readjusted as to give the bulky, basic, low-priced commodities, such as agricultural products, coal and ores, the lowest rates, placing the higher rates upon more valuable and less bulky manufactured products." Of course they should. But how can it be managed, when some roads derive most of their revenues from the bulky products, others from the more valuable ones? Cut the revenues of the granger roads and increase those of the New Haven and the New York Central? The readjustment involves plainly a consolidation of the two kinds of roads. But this the platform does not propose.

The Federal Reserve system is to be administered in the interest of business stability. It is our impression that the present administration of the system is trying to achieve exactly this end. But there cannot be business stability without stability of prices. What has the Democratic party to say about means of measuring or establishing such stability? Just nothing at all.

The platform promises to carry on actively re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clamation projects "and to make equitable adjustment for the mistakes the government has made." There are two conceptions of the proper handling of reclamation projects. According to the one, the government should limit its activity to providing water on arid projects, to cutting the ditches in swamps reclaimed. The settler, chosen on the principle first come first served, would be responsible for the further work of leveling, clearing, etc. This is our traditional conception. The other conception would require the government to carry the work through to the "ready-made" farm and plant settlers after careful selection. Do the Democrats mean to follow the latter conception? They do not say. But if they do not the reclamation situation will remain exactly where it is now.

Do the economic clauses of the Democratic platform offer a sufficient reason why any progressive should give up the project of an independent party and cast in his lot with the Democrats? It does not so appear to us. What the times demand is first a national transportation system, so coördinated that any readjustment of charges necessary to restore the industrial-agricultural balance can be effected without injustice to particular interests. Second, a national solution of the super-power question which shall prevent the advance in power technique from introducing a new monopoly factor into our economic life. Third, an energetic handling of the problem of differential income, so that special advantages in natural resources or commercial location shall not result in excessive differences in private wealth. Fourth, a new relation of labor to the control of production, to overcome the disintegrating effect of the treatment of labor as a commodity, which still prevails in spite of pious mumblings about the humanity of labor. Fifth, a thoroughgoing survey, economic and social, of the position of our agricultural population, and the development of a systematic policy for the conservation of this vital element in our national life.

To these progressive ends some of the economic proposals of the Democratic platform might contribute, modestly and incidentally. But there is no evidence in the platform of a general plan of progressive nation building, or of the recognition of the need of such a plan. Fundamentally, the Democratic party remains the party of nineteenth century individualism, a pioneer party surviving beyond the pioneering epoch. The progressive of today who does not wish to turn his back on politics has, we believe, no alternative to the building up of a party of his own.

The Middle-Aged Woman

IN strict truth there is no such person as the middle-aged woman. The notion of a person possessed of age and sex but no other characteristics is simply unthinkable. Individuals have individuality. They have many traits that seem to be peculiar to them alone. They also bear the marks of many groupings. In particular, they are poor or rich, lowly or exalted in the social scale. Indeed, that middle-aged woman whose place in contemporary American civilization is such an enigma is not merely a female in her forties or fifties. The woman of the laboring classes does not enjoy the luxury of a problem. She works in a factory or at a tub until she goes to pieces. Her transition is the direct one from youth to old age. The same is true of the lady aristocrat. There is no break in her preoccupations. Bred to society, to the higher culture, to the absorbing tasks of public charity, she pursues her interests steadily enough straight through life. The woman who finds a problem on her hands when she receives her honorable discharge from the nursery is the married woman of the middle classes. The problem relates to the occupations of women in middle class homes.

In a very real sense it is not an age problem at all. Middle-age is a physiological phenomenon. As such it is particularly clearly marked in women. But the menopause has no explicit occupational significance. Indeed, it does not even coincide in time with the onset of the occupational disorder that attacks the middle class mother when her children pass into maturity. That commonly comes at a later date. Moreover, the event itself can be understood only as happening to, not in, the middle-aged woman. The essence of the case is that the world about her has changed while she has not. Having been a mother assiduously for twenty odd years she is discharged and put on the retired list with a pension and no occupation. This can hardly be described as an organic change in the mother's system.

Neither is this occupational break an acute and limited disorder. Obviously it is nothing more than the climax of events that have been in train for a very long time, events that can be seen to be leading to just this inevitable crash. In part the course of these events is laid through the woman's own life and follows the curve of her own unconscious choices. She married for love, not for a career, and her children were born of love, not to provide her with an occupation. Yet without having embarked deliberately upon a career of motherhood she has understood that such might be her fate and has tacitly accepted the rôle with all its implications unscrutinized. One of these implications is the ultimate maturing of the children and hence the automatic dissolution of that ex officio career. Another development, for which she has had faith in her husband, is success, the rise to better fortunes, to a greater degree of ease and comfort. The agency of ease in the home is "help," and as such it is desired and intended. But the corollary of help is the disappearance of occupation.

Both phases of the process are gradual enough for their implications to be assimilated, one would think. But gradual effects are the most difficult to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

estimate. Frequently they are never wholly obvious to those who suffer from them. There is a large army of the unconsciously unemployed. But the real reason for the failure of the middle-aged woman of 1924 to foresee her fate is that the world has changed. After all, she entered her life of domesticity not so much in ignorance as upon an understanding of home management as it was before the dairies, the bakeries, the laundries, the cloak, suit and lingerie shops and the beauty parlors reduced the teeming establishment of a generation ago to the prevailing five or six rooms and bath. Furthermore she could not foresee the ultimate effect of her determination to have no more than three children, as against her mother's twelve. Thus the home she married for has passed away. She made a contract for services for life. There has been a revolution. All contracts dating to the old régime are repudiated. Her services are no longer required.

That being the case, there are three things for her to do: she can go on blindly repeating the motions of once necessary tasks; she can ride a thumping hobby horse; or she can perfume and decorate her idleness. Not long ago the New Republic published a spirited defense of the first of these alternatives by Mrs. Alice Wholey. She had her heroine discharge her "help" and go to scrubbing floors. By that she sought to retain at least some slender thread of continuity in an interrupted life. The reality of the problem is attested by an extensive and spirited correspondence stimulated by the strong disapproval which many other women have felt of Mrs. Wholey's theory. Indeed, nothing could have indicated the reality of the problem more vividly than the heat with which her critics have denied it. We have no wish to defend Mrs. Wholey; she alone is responsible for what she chose to say. But her central point, Marian's humble but dauntless honesty, seems to have been imperfectly understood.

A pretty stop-gap is a stop-gap still. Mrs. Wholey's critics have urged her distraught heroine to be a light of culture in her home, or to be a sword of civic righteousness in her neighborhood. Both are laudable ambitions. But by hypothesis both would be defense mechanisms for this woman. She has not devoted herself in the past to the cultivation of her tastes in a life of æsthetically discriminating idleness. Her horror of sitting about and reading poetry "to no constructive end" reveals her—possibly deplorable—bourgeoise background, and so does her contempt of the diddling and fussing over the deserving poor with which others of her kind conceal from themselves their own sterility. She herself has said it: she is a middle class matron. No makeshift occupation can heal the cleft between the busy-work of middle-age and the genuine demands of her earlier life. The interests which are poked at her by common convention are alien to her origins and history. They are flowering twigs from another stock. Their roots are in another soil, the leisure class. She resents and repels the grafting process, first because it signifies that her own branches have been broken off and then because the renewing slip is alien to her roots and sap. Under these circumstances floor scrubbing is a gesture of deep spiritual honesty: it is the preservation intact of at least the broken stump of her own life. Mrs. Wholey's critics miss this point.

One hesitates to hazard a suggestion in so desperate an issue. Yet the scrubbing does squeeze out a protest, it is so futureless. The middle-aged woman must face the facts, of course. She must accept the fact of broken continuity, write off the loss and begin again on something. She can hardly hope to complete a new career. But she can at least choose one constructively. She can achieve the triumph of setting out on some activity that is as appropriate to her as eighteenth century conversation is to others, some profession that does not give the lie to her character and to the circumstances of her past life, as she feels slumming and poet-tasting inevitably do. The choice itself will score her victory.

She can also do one further thing: she can be honest with the young. If the present generation of middle class girls are to be saved the pain of a broken life at fifty they must be allowed to see the occupation of home-making as it is. They are realists, anyhow. But they are more susceptible to the massed opinions of older people than they seem to be. Therefore the middle-aged woman must see that the elders keep hands off. The heads of the young must not be stuffed with a conventional picture of a profession, "the only profession proper to a woman," that is as extinct as the dinosaur. They must be encouraged to equip themselves now with interests and occupations that can be combined in some degree with homes and even families, interests that a woman can keep throughout her life as a continuous personal preoccupation, that will carry her straight through unaffected by the flow and ebb of family responsibilities. In short, the middle-aged woman must coöperate with history. For history will have its way in any case.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1924, IN THE U. S., BY REPUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., INC., 421 W. 21ST ST., NEW YORK.

HERBERT CROLY, PRES. ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREAS. DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON R. M. LOVETT STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY R. H. TAWNEY
DAVID FRIDAY H. N. BRAILSFORD LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Democracy Fumbles

THE Democratic party this year, confronted by a great opportunity, has fumbled it. In its desperate anxiety to win it has, in my judgment, overreached itself.

These lines are being written while balloting for the presidential candidate is still going on; but the chances seem strong that the delegates will not select a wholeheartedly progressive leader any more than they wrote a wholeheartedly progressive platform. In 1920 they didn't really believe they had a chance of winning, and therefore permitted themselves the luxury of being reasonably consistent. In 1924 they do expect to win; and because of that belief they want enormously to please everyone and run a grave danger of pleasing no one.

The first week of the convention was marked by vigorous fights on several issues—fights which were in part at least the natural accompaniment of a period when important past policies are being discarded and new ones adopted. The liberalism during the régime of Wilson now turns out to have been his personal contribution, as was the liberalism of the Republican party during the Roosevelt era. By 1924 the Wilsonian influence has been dissipated. The delegates cheer hysterically at mention of his name. They hang his picture in the convention hall. They are willing in fact to do anything for his memory's sake except to perpetuate his policies. When it came to the test, they decisively refused to get squarely behind his League of Nations. After having said all the fine things about it they could think of, they referred the question to the people as a whole, by proposing a referendum on it, to be held some time between elections, a referendum by which Congress would be morally but not legally bound.

The uncertainty of politics is vividly demonstrated by the fact that the outstanding question of this convention has been the Ku Klux Klan. In advance no such thought was in the minds of the party leaders. The normal expectation was that the party would follow the Republican lead, say a few harmless words about freedom of speech and the wickedness of persecuting a man for race or religion, and let it go at that. Such indeed has been the final result; but it was achieved only by the decision of a majority of some four and a fraction votes, out of 1,098; and even then only with a number of challenges and by the enforcement of the unit rule which in several states suppressed minorities which wanted to vote the other way. The test came at one o'clock Sunday morning after a dramatically impassioned eight-hour session. During the whole of this time there was imminent danger of open warfare between the pro-Klan delegates and the New York crowds in the galleries, who were supporters of Al Smith for the nomination, perhaps Roman Catholics, and therefore opponents of the K. K. K. on the double ground of religious and political hostility. There was also a real possibility that if the plank of the Resolutions Committee minority denouncing the Klan by name had been adopted the members of that order would have sabotaged the party, both in the convention and the election.

While the Klan issue was the high spot of the convention, its most thrilling moment had to do with another subject. It was furnished by Newton D. Baker, former Secretary of War, in an impassioned and moving appeal for an unequivocal endorsement of going into the League of Nations. Mr. Baker's great oratorical skill, his telling analysis of the weakness of the referendum on the League, and his unquestionable sincerity profoundly moved his audience. The delegates, however, were not there to be influenced by logic no matter how convincing. They were there to obey the orders of their leaders who were positive that the League issue would be a deadly incubus for the party in this year's campaign. Accordingly, they cheered Mr. Baker but mustered only 353 and ½ votes for him, and 742 and ½ against.

As is always the case, personalities have ruled the convention. As I write Smith and McAdoo still lead the balloting, and their candidatures have overshadowed everything else. The fights on the League and the Klan which were carried from the Resolutions Committee to the floor of the convention, both resulted in McAdoo victories. The League referendum plan originated in quarters close to him, and the elements which opposed naming the K. K. K. were of course among the McAdoo supporters. Only one of these two votes, however, constituted a defeat for Smith. While his supporters fought earnestly to denounce the Klan by name, they were little concerned about the League issue. Tammany has no foreign policy.

As is also usual, the nominating speeches for the leading candidates were the signals for huge and long drawn out demonstrations, the galleries cheering, delegates parading with their state standards, and the official band obligingly joining in on every occasion. According to custom, these demonstrations were bitterly excoriated on all sides because of their patently artificial character, the nuisance they caused by suspending all business and the professionalism of their participants. (I hereby predict that the convention of 1928 will be the scene of similar disgraceful proceedings, to be followed by the regular crop of newspaper editorials saying that this sort of thing must cease.)

The demonstration for Smith did, it must be admitted, set a new high-water mark for utter artificiality. On the day when Franklin Roosevelt was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to place the New York governor in nomination—which he did in a speech second only to Mr. Baker's in brilliance and power—several thousand ticketless Tammany workers "crashed the gate" at the Garden and took places in the galleries. Shortly thereafter the police roped off the vicinity of the building and ticket holders who subsequently appeared were told, with the utmost politeness and good nature, to go chase themselves. The Smith demonstration was directed by captains placed about the hall, taking their orders from a generalissimo near the speakers' platform. Every known variety of noise-making apparatus was used including a number of electrically-driven automobile sirens. When the signal was given the young men who had assembled for that purpose turned on the noise and kept it going for something like an hour and a half, which was about fifty percent longer than the McAdoo forces had continued.

The pumped-up character of such a demonstration soon becomes painfully apparent to all who are forced to suffer it. It is probably true that nobody ever lived, not even the greatest hero of history, whoever he was, who could elicit from his admirers voluntary cheering for more than fifteen or twenty consecutive minutes. If this is true when the admired one is present in the flesh how much more is it the case when he is absent!—when the occasion for the applause is only the mention of his name in the course of a speech containing no surprises, a speech the general character of which has been accurately known for months, perhaps even for years in advance! The general belief of observers was that both McAdoo's and Smith's chances had been hurt by the violent enthusiasm of their adherents—enthusiasm which in the case of Smith went to such lengths that Chairman Walsh publicly threatened the convention would be moved to another city if speakers were not given a fairer hearing. It would probably be nearer the truth to say, however, that the demonstrations neither gained or lost votes for any of the candidates on whose behalf they were held. It is an open question whether as many as twenty votes were changed for any cause between the opening of the convention on Tuesday and the first Presidential ballot on the following Monday. Delegates do not take oratory too seriously, no matter how loudly they respond to its momentary appeal.

This discrepancy between oratorical fiction and convention fact was strikingly shown when the full text of the platform finally appeared. Speaker after speaker had asserted that the Democrats are the only friends of the common man, the party of utter light and peerless leading, implacable foes of cowardice as well as wickedness. Yet the platform finally adopted is just about half way between nothing at all and a genuinely liberal progressive document. Its League policy represents a decisive break with that of 1920. It straddles on the Ku Klux Klan, with a plank aimed straight at that order but without daring to call it by name. It quibbles on prohibition, on the railroad question, on Muscle Shoals. It calls for improved waterways from the Middle West to the Atlantic, but is afraid to identify the St. Lawrence canal project as such.

It omits any mention of labor's great grievance, the use of the injunction in strikes, and suggests, against the wishes of at least the A. F. of L., that "hours and conditions" of labor should be regulated by law. While it makes several suggestions for farm relief, they are all in vague and general language. Even the most concrete of them, the endorsement of the McNary-Haugen bill, is couched in dangerously ambiguous language. The passage condemning the Federal Reserve System for contracting the currency was apparently written to be interpreted in the radical West as a plea for cheap money.

On the other hand, to the credit of the convention as showing some courage, whether you agree with the policies or not, must be recorded the demands for a publicly-owned "giant power" system, for immediate independence for the Philippines, the endorsement of the Norris amendment to the Constitution abolishing "lame duck" Congresses, and the proposals for popular vote on all Constitutional amendments, the conscription of capital in war-time, and national referenda on going to war "except in case of actual or threatened attack." These are not, of course, the only notable planks in the platform. But they are the only ones with any element of surprise about them.

This convention was loudly touted in advance as being sure to "bring New York back into the Union"; but any such result was badly hampered by the Ku Klux Klan issue, and the closely-correlated Al Smith candidacy. From first to last the galleries were overwhelmingly anti-Klan. It is perhaps unfair, but is undubitably true that most delegates identified the spectators as New York residents, Roman Catholics and wets. Also, the loyal but indiscreet efforts of the local citizenry in general—policemen, taxi drivers, telephone operators, even newsboys—to influence delegates in favor of their hero undoubtedly created a bad impression. Insofar as there has been in the past any lack of understanding and sympathy between New York and the rest of the country, the convention has done nothing to heal the breach.

In advance, much was made of the fact that the delegates would have a chance to see and to understand a little better the country's metropolis; but it did not work out this way. The delegates herded with one another and except physically, saw little of New York. Gotham, on the other hand, has had its first real chance to study Main Street in action, with decidedly interesting results. The sophisticated New Yorker, of the type perhaps best represented (despite the Middle Western origin of some of them) by the newspaper columnists, has gazed upon the convention with a disgust which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deepened as time passed into a sort of fascinated horror. He found the oratory bad beyond belief—dull, bombastic, insincere, repetitious and above all, insufferably long-winded. He looked on with angry scorn as speaker after speaker, announced to take three or four minutes, took ten or twelve and was at last hauled off the platform by the coat-tails. He watched with weary nausea as a nominator, having spoken for thirty minutes, named his man and then after the demonstration had started, frantically hushed it and went on forty minutes longer. He wondered, as he listened, feverish with fatigue, whether the delegates had all gone crazy.

The truth is, of course, that this is what Main Street is like, though the New Yorker has never known it or has forgotten such knowledge as he once possessed. The oratory at the Democratic Convention, desolatingly bad as it was, was no worse than all American oratory, and probably no worse than most of it has always been. The tempo of life on farm and in village is slower than in the metropolis. The delegate whose visit to New York will be one of the two or three great events of his life doesn't mind a few extra hours devoted to hearing men of his own breed indulging in a familiar type of verbal fireworks. After all, what's time to a delegate?

While New York scorns the convention, the delegates with some justice can scorn certain aspects of New York. The nation's largest city was able to offer nothing better than an aged and inadequate gathering place, inferior in ventilation and acoustics, a fire-trap haunted by faint smells of the circus, its annual occupant. In the broiling heat which prevailed on several days during the first week, to sit through a lengthy session was an act of real physical endurance.

On only a few occasions in the history of the convention was this endurance amply rewarded. First on the list comes the scene at twilight Saturday evening when Newton D. Baker made his gallant fight for endorsement of the League. Second, perhaps, one would place the occasion a little later in the same evening when Andrew C. Erwin, a tall young man from Georgia, and almost the only anti-Klansman in his delegation, stood up bravely and demanded that his state throw off the dominance of the hooded order. A third dramatic moment, much later that night, was when the the youthful Miss Marion Colley, also from Georgia, after being bullied by a dozen men until she was frightened nearly out of her wits, changed her vote and thereby, as she believed, defeated the minority report of the Resolutions Committee which called the Klan by name.

A fourth high spot, for many, came when Franklin Roosevelt, rising bravely above the handicap of physical incapacity, made a fine speech putting Al Smith in nomination—a speech which struck home to all those who believe in the American tradition that every private's knapsack should contain a marshal's baton, that there is something thrilling and fine in the rise of any man from newsboy to governor and Presidential aspirant. And there was a fifth thrill, witnessed by no reporter, when the Resolutions Committee rose at six o'clock in the morning after having battled all night, and for three previous days, in the hopeless effort to reach agreement, and by a sort of spontaneous consent, uttered the Lord's Prayer in unison.

A thrill of a different sort was found when William Jennings Bryan stood up to advocate that the convention should pussyfoot on the naming of the Klan. To those whose memories went back even as far as his great speech at San Francisco four years ago, it was shocking to see how much of his former glory had departed in the interval. Like every other member of the Resolutions Committee, he was, of course, rocking on his feet with fatigue; but this fact alone could not explain his failure to hold his auditors. Baker, as tired as Bryan, made a finer address than the elder statesman has achieved in at least a decade past.

These moments of drama were memorable; and they stood out all the more vividly because most of the sessions were so completely without the divine spark. No sweeping generalization about this convention could be entirely fair. It has done some fine things, very few of which are definitely bad, and a number which like the soul of Tomlinson are fit neither for Heaven nor hell. If the candidate whom it will have nominated, perhaps during the interval between the writing and the reading of these lines, proves to be a genuine progressive he may be able to counterbalance to some extent the timidity, the evasions and vagueness of the platform. Whether the discontented West, dissatisfied labor, the unattached liberals of the East can be roused to enthusiasm over any candidate handicapped by such a platform—these are questions which I shall be glad to answer for inquirers on and after Wednesday, November 5, 1924.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

On the Line

Nobody knows, now, when he first began
To pass from life to legend, how he turned
Into this "Portrait of a Gentleman,"
Impeccable, aloof and unconcerned.
Romney or Reynolds would have painted him
In wig and ermine: as a landed squire,
Conscious of his aristocratic limb,
Fastidious in each trifle of attire.

But we are come upon an age too crass
For flowered waistcoats. If he lives at all
It will not be in any looking-glass
Held up to *our* vainglory! To forestall
Huckster historians, call him one of those
Who could keep silent counsel when he chose.

LESLIE NELSON JENNINGS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Toward the Outlawry of War

THE draft treaty framed and submitted by the American committee to the League at Geneva is the most encouraging event in the movement for peace which has taken place for many a day.

I say this without regard to the particular terms of the treaty and without regard to changes which will undoubtedly appear necessary as discussion proceeds. Four great church conferences, or conventions, within the last sixty days have declared for the outlawry of war. With true insight into the situation as it really exists and with masterly comprehension of the question, these church associations, or conventions, have made the question of outlawry the dominant question. Now, there is submitted at Geneva the draft of a treaty contemplating the signature of all nations, solemnly declaring "that aggressive war is an international crime." Putting aside, therefore, for the present the terms of the treaty, which we will all wish to consider more at our leisure, let us reflect a moment upon what all this means in the progress toward peace and as a matter of molding public opinion to the end that war as an institution for the settlement of international disputes shall pass forever under the ban and take its place with murder and piracy where it rightly belongs.

From the beginning of recorded history, men have schemed and planned for peace and have submitted ambitious proposals in that behalf. But these proposals have speedily passed away, leaving no durable result behind. All these schemes, or plans, so far as we are advised, recognized war, wars of invasion, wars of aggression, all kinds of war, as legitimate. War was neither denounced by international codes, international law, or agreements, nor condemned by the moral judgment of mankind. Peace was desirable, but if anyone wanted to go to war for any reason, no condemnation attached. Even William Penn, in many respects the noblest of all the advocates of peace, in his great proposal recognized war as a legitimate institution for the settlement of international controversies and no condemnation under his scheme rested upon any nation which invoked it. The League of Nations framed at Versailles recognizes war as legitimate, and in some instances, relies upon it for the settlement of international disputes. But any scheme for peace, any alliance made in the name of peace, holy or unholy, which recognizes war as legal will speedily become nothing more than a military alliance. That is as logical and inevitable as that night must succeed the day. It must necessarily follow that any combination, agreement, or understanding which recognizes war as a proper method of settling disputes will ultimately come to rely upon war as a method of settling disputes. So long as force is recognized as the final arbiter in international affairs, force will be appealed to in preference to courts or conciliation commissions. Anyone with a casual knowledge of history or the slightest conception of human nature will, upon reflection readily realize this.

If there be those nations which are anxious to form a league, ostensibly for peace, but are unwilling to sign a treaty making war a crime, you may rest assured that they look upon the league, whatever may be its expressed purpose, as nothing more than a military alliance. All the great nations of Europe regarded the League as really a military alliance. And France, with more candor than others, openly declared at Versailles that that is what it should be, and with more boldness than others, that is what she is now making it. If there be individuals who want a league of nations or a world court, while war is still recognized as legitimate and may be invoked even by the League, then they are content to trifle with the most vital problem ever submitted to mankind for its solution, and that is, the problem of how to be rid of this cruel and savage system of indiscriminate murder, euphoniously called war. We must all derive great pleasure therefore from the fact that we are at last accepting the stone which the builders have heretofore rejected, and propose to make outlawry of war the precedent and dominant principle for which we shall contend, the basis upon which all plans for peace shall be built. Without such a principle acknowledged and accepted as a basis for all plans and schemes of peace, leagues and international courts must become either worthless, or in the end dangerous. Dr. John Dewey has said: "Unless the moral sentiment of the world has reached the point of condemning war, there is nothing that can be done about it. If it has reached this stage, then that conviction should be crystallized in law—in orderly, authorized procedure."

I do not see how you are going to stop war or even check war until you outlaw war, make war as an institution for the settlement of international disputes a crime and hold responsible those who foment war. President Wilson most correctly declared: "Peoples do not make war." Less than a score of men brought on the Great War. No nation was responsible for that war, no peoples were responsible for it. It was forced upon the world with all its attendant sacrifices and misery by a few men. Lord Loreburn, the Ex-Chancellor of England, declared: "We went to war in a Russian quarrel because we were tied to France in the dark. This nation was guided blindfold until it came to the exit, and on the bandages being removed, was confronted by the awful visage of war." Lord Hugh Cecil declared: "When war was decided

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon, it was not decided by the House of Commons or the electorate, but by the concurrence of ministers and ex-ministers." These same men, or some of them, and the same breed of men, the same system and the same policies, are again leading the world to the verge of war. How shall we control such situations except by declaring war a crime and making the fomenters of war criminally liable? What other protection have the people against being manipulated into war?

How utterly vain are all schemes for peace not based upon the principle that war is a crime and its fomenters to be dealt with as criminals, may be illustrated by what has taken place since the organization of the League of Nations. Every war of invasion, every invasion of territory, since the League was created has been by a member of the League. Every move for disarmament has been opposed by a member of the League. Every military alliance since the Treaty of Versailles has been initiated by a member of the League. It was a League member which incited Greece to war and then deserted her in her humiliation and defeat. It was a League member which armed and financed Turkey and brought her back into power. The army which butchered helpless and defenseless women and children on that field of carnage in Asia Minor was armed and equipped by a member of the League of Nations. The three invasions of Russia were equipped and munitioned by members of the League of Nations. The Serb-Croat-Slovene state began war on Albania. Albania appealed to the League, the League evaded the issue, and the war continued between the two members of the League. The Italian Fascisti under D'Annunzio, began war on and captured Fiume. Italy was a member of the League and of the Council at the time. Italy later expelled D'Annunzio but kept Fiume. Greece was a member of the League when she invaded Asia Minor. Poland, a member of the League, invaded and took Vilna and began war on Lithuania. Poland, a member of the League used arms against Eastern Galicia. France, a member of the League, invaded the Ruhr.

It has been repeatedly said that the plan for outlawing war is illusory and impracticable. It is not so much so as the plan to end war, while all nations and all international plans for peace still recognize war as legitimate, as morally permissible, still rely upon force as the ultimate arbiter. When the sentiment of mankind has been taught to look upon war as a crime and when that sentiment has been crystallized into international law and to be construed by an independent international judicial tribunal, the world will be near to universal peace. The work of educating the world to this task is tremendous. But unless we are to go on as we have for three thousand years, talking peace and practising war, we shall at once undertake the task; we shall seek to change the attitude of the public mind toward war, as the first step to end war. If, therefore, this proposed treaty marks another step in an effort to found the plans of peace upon the proposition that war is a crime, that it is no longer recognized as an institution for the settlement of international disputes, it is the most encouraging feature of the peace movement which has transpired since the Armistice. I sincerely hope we are to move tremendously along these lines and that this treaty will be made to conform absolutely to the proposition of outlawing war.

WILLIAM E. BORAH.

De-Bunking Mr. Dawes

IN the course of his first speech as a candidate Charles Gates Dawes, the Republican nominee for Vice-President, said:

> In the campaign which is before me . . . I pledge myself to adhere to the truth and to the common sense conclusions to be drawn therefrom. As to the demagogue on the stump, whatever may be his party, I want it distinctly understood that in the coming campaign I ask no quarter and will give none.

Is it not, therefore, appropriate immediately to consider the truth about Mr. Dawes and the "common sense conclusions to be drawn therefrom" as to his fitness for the Vice-Presidency? Mr. Dawes describes himself as a "financier." (See Who's Who.) He was Comptroller of the Currency from 1897 to 1902 and has been president of the Central Trust Company of Illinois since that date (until recently made chairman of the board of directors). He was admitted to the Bar in 1886 and practised law for some seven years. He is, therefore, a banker and a lawyer. The quality of his character, the soundness of his ethics and the depth of his integrity may well be tested by his acts as a banker, and perhaps more safely than by his speeches as a politician.

The records of the Supreme Court of Illinois show that Mr. Dawes, without the knowledge or authority of the board of directors or executive committee of his bank, furnished William Lorimer on October 21, 1912, with $1,250,000 in cash of the Central Trust Company, which was counted by a state bank examiner as the property of the LaSalle Street Trust and Savings Bank, which Mr. Lorimer was organizing to take the place of the LaSalle Street National Bank which was rapidly going on the rocks. The money was then immediately returned to the Central Trust Company. In the language of the Supreme Court of Illinois:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Thus the LaSalle Street Trust and Savings Bank instead of beginning business with a capital stock and surplus of $1,250,000 in cash, as the statute required, and without liabilities, began business on October 22, 1912, with the assets of the LaSalle Street National Bank and with all its liabilities.

On June 12, 1914, the LaSalle Street Trust and Savings Bank was closed by the Auditor of Public Accounts. Subsequently its assets, according to the attorney for the receiver, "were found to be insufficient by more than $2,000,000 to satisfy the claims of its depositors and other creditors." In addition the stockholders of the bank, many of them persons of small means and innocent of any wrong-doing, lost their investments and were compelled to pay, under the law, amounts equal to the par value of their stock. In an opinion filed April 19, 1917, the Supreme Court of Illinois discussed Mr. Dawes's part in this transaction. The facts found by the Supreme Court are worthy of consideration by those who are asked to vote for Mr. Dawes for Vice-President of the United States, in order that "common sense conclusions" may be drawn therefrom.

The LaSalle Street National Bank commenced business on May 10, 1910, with William Lorimer, then United States Senator from Illinois, as its president. The Supreme Court states:

> During its existence it was examined at various times by a national bank examiner and its method of doing business had been severely criticized by him. Changes had been required by the Comptroller of the Currency and had been promised, but the promise had not been complied with.

It also appears that the bank was unable to obtain membership in the Clearing House Association and that the Corn Exchange National Bank, through which it cleared its checks for a time, later refused to continue as clearing agent. It was apparent by October, 1912, that the Comptroller of the Currency would not permit the bank to continue carrying on business much longer. The scheme was then devised to change the National Bank to a state bank. The Illinois law required that the capital stock and surplus of the state bank should be paid in cash. Considerable difficulty was encountered in obtaining the necessary cash, but the Supreme Court reports that on October 21, 1912, the following arrangement was made:

> William Lorimer, the president of the national bank, on this same day called upon Charles G. Dawes, the president of the Central Trust Company, and told him that he would want an amount of money equal to the capital and surplus of the new bank to be counted by the agent of the auditor in compliance with the requirement of the law, and that the bank did not have that much currency.

The opinion continues:

> Nine of the directors, in accordance with the auditor's requirement, made an affidavit that $1,250,000, all the capital and surplus of the bank, "is actually paid in, in cash, and no part thereof is in notes or pledges of any description, and that said capital and surplus is now in the hands of the proper officials of said association, as above set forth, and is to be used by them solely in the legitimate business of the association when the same shall be opened for banking." This was delivered to John H. Rife, an examiner from the auditor's office, who then, accompanied by Lorimer, who had been elected president of the bank, and Charles E. Ward, one of the directors, went to the bank of the Central Trust Company for the purpose of verifying the statements of the affidavit and satisfying himself that the cash was actually in the possession of the officers of the bank and dedicated to the business of the bank. There $1,250,000 in currency was delivered to Lorimer by the cashier of the Central Trust Company. Rife counted the money and returned it to Lorimer, together with the auditor's certificate authorizing the trust and savings bank to commence business as a bank. Lorimer handed the money back to the cashier, who returned the cashier's check, indorsed by the Central Trust Company without recourse.

After the failure of the state bank the receiver brought suit against the Central Trust Company on the ground that it had received funds belonging to the LaSalle Street Trust and Savings Bank and retained them without authority of law and a decree was rendered against the Central Trust Company in the amount of $1,487,854.16. The Supreme Court found the Central Trust Company to be liable in the following language:

> The Central Trust Company having represented that the $1,250,000 exhibited to the auditor's agent was the property of the LaSalle Street Trust and Savings Bank, and having immediately taken and retained possession of it to the exclusion of the bank, in an action for an accounting for the benefit of the creditors of the trust and savings bank it must make good its representation and must account for the money so wrongfully taken by it.

After the evidence had been heard the Central Trust Company made an effort to escape liability by alleging:

> . . . that the entire transaction in question was done and carried out by William R. Dawes, the cashier of the Trust Company under the authority of Charles G. Dawes, its president, without the knowledge or authority of the board of directors or executive committee. . . . and that any acts done by them of that character were beyond their authority and not binding on the trust company.

The Supreme Court held that the Central Trust Company was responsible for the actions of the cashier of the bank which were within the scope of his authority. However, the Court held that the Central Trust Company was liable only for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amount to which the capital stock of the National Bank was impaired at the time of the transfer to the State Bank. Therefore, the decree was reversed and the case was referred to a master in chancery to determine the value of the assets of the National Bank on October 21, 1912.

In April, 1922, the Appellate Court for the First District handed down an opinion in which Mr. Presiding Justice O'Connor ruled that the Central Trust Company was liable for $737,220.54 plus 5 percent interest making a total liability of $978,029.11. Mr. Justice Thomson dissenting held that the capital stock and surplus of the bank were wholly impaired and the Central Trust Company should be liable for $1,250,000, plus interest. Mr. Justice Taylor concurred except as to five items, fixing the liability of the Central Trust Company at $597,411.94, plus interest. On appeal to the Supreme Court the opinion of the Appellate Court was reversed in April, 1924, and a re-hearing denied in June, 1924.

In its final opinion the Supreme Court has reaffirmed its original opinion, stating "we make the distinct point here that the law of the case now in hand so far as announced in our former decision is still the law of the case and our former decision must be taken as a complete answer to all arguments against its correctness." In reviewing the facts upon which to determine the amount of the liability of the Central Trust Company, the Supreme Court put a much higher value on the assets of the National Bank than any of the three judges of the Appellate Court and entered a decree against the trust company for "the sum of $110,457.51, including interest at 5 percent from September 25, 1915, and for the costs in the Circuit Court." As is shown by the opinion of the Appellate Court, able and disinterested lawyers may disagree as to the amount of liability of Mr. Dawes's bank, but the record closes with the finding maintained that a legal wrong was committed.

The Supreme Court in its first opinion stated that it was "immaterial whether the Central Trust Company or Mr. Dawes had any fraudulent intention, knew anything about the condition of the National Bank, or made any profit out of the transaction." It appears, therefore, that the gentle statements in the opinion of the Appellate Court to the effect that the Central Trust Company and its officers may not have had any idea that they were violating any provision of the law and may have acted "entirely innocently" in the matter, should be regarded in no way as judicial exonerations of Mr. Dawes. They are rather unfortunate indications of the hesitancy of judges to condemn a person of notable wealth and influence. That such courtesies from the Bench are duly appreciated is clearly shown by the vigorous manner in which Mr. Dawes, for example, organizes his Minute Men of the Constitution to protect the courts against "unjust assaults."

It is not perhaps of particular interest to the general public to consider the complicated legal issues involved in this protracted litigation. It should be, however, of much interest at the present time to consider the business principles and ethical standards exhibited. As the Supreme Court stated:

> The object of the Banking Act is the protection of the depositors and creditors of the bank, and the requirement of the possession of the whole amount of capital and surplus in cash at the organization of the bank is for their benefit.

Clearly Mr. Dawes could not have been ignorant of the object of the Banking Act. Clearly as the president of a large Chicago bank cashing a check for $1,250,000 he could not have been ignorant of the general condition of the LaSalle Street National Bank, nor ignorant of the results likely to flow from allowing $1,250,000 of the funds of the Central Trust Company to be counted as the funds of the new state bank. The Supreme Court discusses the situation as follows:

> The elaborate system of notes, checks and bookkeepers' entries, debit and credit, do not affect the substance of the transaction. They did not create any cash, and if none of those documents had been executed and none of the entries made the substance of the transaction would still have been the same, and that was, that the Central Trust Company, at Lorimer's request, permitted him to hand to the auditor's representative $1,250,000 of the trust company's money as the money which the directors of the LaSalle Street Trust and Savings Bank had in their affidavit stated was in the hands of the officers of the bank, to be used solely in its legitimate business. Of course, the auditor's agent was not brought there to satisfy himself that there was that much money in some bank in Chicago, and, of course, nobody thought so. The counting of the money is spoken of as a technical requirement of the auditor, but if it is properly regarded as a technical requirement nobody could reasonably imagine that the counting of $1,250,000 of anybody's money would satisfy the requirement. It was the bank's capital and surplus about which the auditor was required to satisfy himself, and the exhibition and delivery of the money to him was as the bank's capital, which was stated in the affidavit to be in the possession of the bank's officers and was produced from their depositary for his inspection. This amounted to a solemn declaration that the particular currency which was there present was the property of the LaSalle Street Trust and Savings Bank, dedicated solely to its business and subject absolutely to its control.

In his opening speech as a Vice-Presidential candidate, Mr. Dawes refers to "the curse of demagoguery in political discussions in this country." He asks all good citizens to "unite in demanding from those who represent us in political debates that they present our differences honestly and from the standpoint of truth, not from the standpoint of passion and prejudice." Certainly Mr. Dawes cannot complain if the facts regarding his con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nection with the failure of Lorimer's state bank are presented, if this is done without any characterizations which might amount to appeals to passion and prejudice. In this case the facts may well be considered without any interpretation other than that which has been furnished by the highest court of the State of Illinois.

DONALD R. RICHBERG.

A Campaign Glossary

A-LARM-IST *n.*; one who protests upon opening the safe-door and finding two hundred and fifty million barrels of oil missing.

BAL-LOT, *v.*; to vote; to cast a ballot; *synonym*—neck, to get it in the.

BEST MINDS, *n.*; *pl.* (obsolete).

BON-US, *n.*; species of legislation characteristic of American politics, in that each party is (1) for it, (2) against it.

DEM-O-CRAT, *n.*; see RE-PUB-LIC-AN.

DIN-NER PAIL, *n.*; usually full, but only if the Republicans (Democrats) turn the Democrats (Republicans) out of office.

DIS-GRUN-TLED, *v.t., p.p.*; unreasonable; stubborn; not satisfied with serving as a highway.

FAR-MER, *n.*; (colloquial); producers with a quaint idea of trading even with the millers.

FEAR-LESS, *adj.*; without fear; willing to wait only for a good technical excuse to discharge a Cabinet officer who is proved corrupt or incompetent.

FEL-LOW-CIT-I-ZENS, *n., pl.*; people who will listen to the fourth paragraph if one of the first three tells a funny story.

FIL-I-BUST-ER, *v.*; to attract attention; to get into the newspapers with the ordinary processes of legislation toward the end of a session.

HAR-MON-Y, *n.*; quality attributed to a political party when its factions agree not to shoot on sight until after the election.

HEM-I-SPHERE, *n.*; usually western; *synonym*—God's green footstool.

HU-MAN IN-TER-EST, *n.*; photograph of a pipe, child, cow, being smoked, kissed, milked, by a candidate for the Presidency of the country.

HYS-TER-I-A, *n.*; uncalled-for excitement on the public's part upon being robbed.

I-DE-AL-IST-IC, *adj.*; term of abuse; used to describe a disagreeable proposal when all else fails.

ILL-AD-VISED, *adj.*; that which is not agreed with; *synonym*—ill-timed, ill-devised, ill-contrived, ill-digested, ill-defined.

IM-PAR-TIAL, *adj.*; not partial; admitting there are arguments on the other side without stating them.

IN-DICT-MENT, *n.*; (slang) method by which what might otherwise prove troublesome is disposed of.

IN-FANT IN-DUS-TRY, *n.*; an industry which needs the protection of a tariff; i.e., an industry earning (a) less than 12 percent on its capital, (b) more than 12 percent.

IN-TER-VIEW, *n.*; a carefully prepared statement mimeographed in bulk and delivered simultaneously to thirty-three hundred newspapers.

LEAD-ER-SHIP, *n.*; the faculty of avoiding being run over by one's own party after having started it.

LOB-BY, *n.*; (1) a place to sit; (2) a reason for a prompt decision.

MAN-I-FEST, *adj.*; only partially opaque.

MIL-LEN-I-UM, *n.*; a period comprising all time more than six months distant, and therefore something so remote as not to engage the interest of the practical politician.

MUD-SLING-ER, *n.*; one who slings mud; i.e., objects to finding someone's else hand in his trouser's pocket.

NEV-ER, *adv.*; often.

NOM-I-NATE, *v.*; conjugated as follows:

I vote	We vote
You vote	You vote
He votes	They nominate

OIL RE-SERVE, *n.*; (humorous term) land thought to have been set aside for the use of a navy.

PAR-A-MOUNT, *adj.*; commonly used to single out certain issues for discussion as especially important; *synonym*—safe.

PLAT-FORM, *n.*; depository for items not conveniently carried elsewhere; *synonym*—bucket.

PROS-E-CU-TION, *n.*; formerly a court term, now used to indicate the passage of time; *synonym*—oblivion.

PROS-PER-I-TY, *n.*; Baldwin Locomotive: open 112½; close 117¾; net gain 5¼.

RE-PUB-LIC-AN, *n.*; see DEM-O-CRAT.

RE-PUD-I-ATE, *v.*; to reject what one would not get anyway.

UN-E-QUIV-O-CAL, adj.; any statement issued by a politician which does not make use of at least three of the following phrases: this does not mean, of course I am not prepared to say, however, nevertheless, for the present, on the other hand.

WHIRL-WIND, *adj.*; campaign in which a candidate travels with more than six staff reporters and his own dining-car.

WILL-OF-THE-PEOPLE, *n.*; what happens, when, at the end of four months of sheer confusion, some 1,250,000 more people put an X in one certain square on a sheet of paper than in a certain other, thus solving for another four years the complicated problem of governing a modern state.

C. M.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The War on the Peace Seekers.—II

ELOQUENT with innuendo is the so-called "spider-web chart," the most extravagant offensive of the Army against the women of America. Events of last spring gave the chart a distribution so wide and so open that much embarrassment was caused in the War Department, and there was an effort to suppress it. However sincere that effort may have been, it was totally ineffective, and the chart circulates now more widely than ever, carrying its burden of suspicion doubtless to millions of homes. By just such insinuation as it contains were witches brought to the fire in Salem and the citizens of France to the guillotine in the early republic.

It is protested that the War Department is not responsible for the chart. Perhaps not, so far as any official statement of approval is concerned. But the best answer to that is the facts. It was prepared by Mrs. Lucia R. Maxwell, librarian in the Chemical Warfare Service. It was photostated in the offices of the War Department, and sent out at least in part from them. Mrs. Maxwell is an old personal friend of Brigadier-General Amos A. Fries, chief of the service, and the first noteworthy bogey-monger of the military. How much encouragement General Fries gave her in her work one cannot say. But women who investigated the matter report that several copies of the chart were sent out by General Fries with an accompanying letter on War Department stationery and over his own signature. It is reported, too, that when members of the organizations accused in the chart went to Mrs. Maxwell with a request for copies of it, she referred them to General Fries, and he referred them back to her. Finally, there is the letter from Secretary Weeks to Maud Wood Park, chairman of the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, regretting that "charts containing the errors pointed out by your committee were circulated by any branch of the War Department," and promising to do his best to have them destroyed or at least publicly repudiated.

The chart was full of errors, but they are insignificant: mistakes chiefly in ascribing relationship among the various societies listed. It sought to illustrate a system of interlocking directorates between the affiliated organizations. It named the Women's Joint Congressional Committee and the National Council for Prevention of War, the two great federations of societies at the capital, and showed that frequently officers of one were officers of another. Among the member societies of these two federations are practically all the women's organizations of the country. So the chart declares, and so the fact remains.

Now, by a quotation from the discredited Lusk report of several years ago, by a bit of doggerel asseverating that "Miss Bolsheviki" is to be found in the women's clubs kneading the bread of wrath and rebellion, by allegations directed at many of our most prominent women by name, this whole system of organizations is branded as Communistic. The challenge of course is absurd. By following in the direction Mrs. Maxwell's finger, rigid with panic, points we find the Needlework Guild of America under suspicion as a Bolshevik agency. We are told to keep our ears alert for strains of the Internationale coming from meetings of the International Sunshine Society. We are warned that even the Ladies of the Maccabees may be distributing bombs! But laughable as it may seem, all this has its grave aspect. The spider-web chart has actually caused already some disaffection among the organizations it stigmatizes.

Further dissemination of the charges of the spider-web chart was made possible through The Dearborn Independent, which, on March 15 and March 22, 1924, published two articles signed by "An American Citizen," the first of them entitled "Are Women's Clubs 'Used' by Bolshevists?" The chart was reproduced by way of illustration. The tenor of these articles is indicated by the following sweetly charitable passage anent social legislation such as the child labor amendment proposed by the women's organizations:

> The heart of everyone is touched by an appeal to care for mothers and babies. The radicals find it easy to build their bureaucracy by selecting such heart appeals because by such means they sweep the uninformed to the polls unknowingly to vote away individual freedom and Constitutional government. . . . Resolutions passed by small delegated bodies representing great organizations endorse the legislative program of Soviet Russia in the name of reform, of peace and of child welfare, and the great majority of the membership of these organizations are unaware that a revolution in the United States is being set on foot through this work of women.

Reaction against the Independent articles was prompt and indignant. The author of them, the "American Citizen," who turns out to be Mrs. Haviland H. Lund, appealed to J. S. Eichelberger, editor of The Woman Patriot and pious Russophobe, for evidence in support of her charges. But Mrs. Lund, like General Bowley, had gone too far. The Woman Patriot repudiated her and acknowledged distortions in her articles. The Dearborn Independent, however, has not yet retracted.

Meanwhile, business hustled to pick up this bludgeon that the Army had provided. The Independent articles were reproduced in the bulletin of the Associated Industries of Kentucky, and more recently in The Monitor, monthly organ of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Associated Industries of New York State, Inc. Is it necessary to point out that business could ask no more than just such propaganda as that contained in the passage quoted from Mrs. Lund?

And finally Mrs. Maxwell is even now planning a new and amplified edition of the chart, to be circulated, she says, by herself as chairman of the Patriotic Committee of the League of American Penwomen. She is seeking to sell to some periodical an article explaining the chart, with the right to reproduce it. She is still an employee of the War Department.

Spider-web chart and General Bowley's speeches, these are the most exacerbating episodes in the Army's campaign against the women. The chronicle of lesser offensives would make a long story.

There is, for instance, the activity of Lieutenant-Colonel H. H. Sheets. We have at hand a copy of a letter sent by Colonel Sheets to Doctor John A. Ryan of the Catholic University of America, who is on the executive board of the National Council for Prevention of War. Doctor Ryan had delivered an address before the convention of the Women's International League of Peace and Freedom. Colonel Sheets demanded answers to a list of questions which imputed to the League and to Doctor Ryan as well a program of violent Communistic doctrines. Religious prejudice was brought out boldly in the letter, which concluded, "Are you willing to be branded as a 'self-appointed destroyer of the nation?'" Copies of this letter were sent to the press.

And there is the incessant propagandizing of such journals as the Army and Navy Register. An article in the November 10, 1923, issue of this organ declared that $3,000,000 in gold had been sent into the United States by the "Communistic International." On the return from Europe of Frederick J. Libby of the National Council for Prevention of War, a campaign to wipe out our army and navy would begin, the article declared, "so that when the red uprising comes the country will be at its mercy."

Perhaps I ought to make clear at this point just what is the issue between the militarists and the women. It should be obvious, I think, that any American citizen who wants to urge a big army and navy, or any other adaptation of Prussianism to our shores, has a perfect right to do so. In theory, at least, this is a free country; and whoever advocates unrestricted utterance on one side must if he is logical advocate it on the other. What the women's organizations object to is the dissemination of falsehoods about themselves by their opponents. The militarists, when they spread the impression that everyone who opposes them is a hireling of Soviet Russia and a Bolshevik, are using tactics as dishonorable as they are cruel.

The women also object to the circulation of slander by the forces of reaction which are opposed, not only to the program of the peace seekers, but also to domestic policies which they fear may "hurt business." The women are advocating, for example, ratification by the states of the child labor amendment; and business interests which are quite willing to batten at the expense of the children join in the hue and cry that the organizations and their leaders are the tools of the Communists.

On several occasions, efforts have been made to point out to the War Department the impropriety and unfairness of the attacks the military men have been making. More than a year ago, a delegation called on Secretary Weeks, following a speech by General Fries at Kansas City in which he declared that the purpose of the National Council for Prevention of War is to establish Communism in this country. On the committee were such people as Charles A. Lyman, of the Farmers' National Union; Marian Parkhurst, of the National League of Women Voters; Ethel Smith, of the National Women's Trade Union League; and Frances F. Bernard, of the American Association of University Women. Secretary Weeks gave them to understand that General Fries would be required to mind his own business. . . . Shortly after this the spider-web chart appeared.

The Women's Joint Congressional Committee immediately named a special committee to handle the matter, with Mrs. Park as chairman. Mrs. Park wrote Secretary Weeks a vigorous letter in which she characterized the chart as "scurrilous and libelous and insulting to every woman voter in these women's organizations." Secretary Weeks replied with his complete repudiation of the chart and promise to destroy all copies of it in his control. . . . Shortly after this came General Bowley and his preposterous speech at Columbus, O., in which he again charged the National Council for Prevention of War, and in particular its executive secretary, Mr. Libby, with plotting a Communist revolution.

Still another committee, just the other day, visited Secretary Weeks. According to a letter from Mr. Lyman, the Secretary said that he "believed General Bowley would make no more charges against the National Council or Mr. Libby." The Secretary also "strongly indicated that the General might wish to make retraction."

Though on each occasion Secretary Weeks expresses his regret at what is going on, somehow or other, this regret has thus far failed to translate itself into an actual suspension of the activities of his subordinates. In general, it is fair to say, they are continuing to do very much what they have been doing right along. And in the meantime, they are looking forward eagerly to September 12, which will be Mobilization Day, when every man, woman and child in the land will be asked either to goose-step, or to join in praise and admiration of goose-stepping.

LEONARD CLINE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bandwagon

Did You Say White?

Chicago, June 14.—Drawing at his old briar, Charles G. Dawes, Republican candidate for Vice-President, returned home today. . . . On the General's desk stood a white elephant, emblematic of the party of which he is an associate standard bearer.

—*New York Times.*

Not One of His Own Ideas in It.

The most unsatisfactory note book for the year's work I have ever had turned in to me. It attempted refutation of everything I had taught during the year.

—*Dr. G. M. Forbes, University of Rochester commenting on the work of one of his students, quoted in the New York Times.*

Still Slightly Above Freezing.

Senator Lodge is said to hold no ill will toward the President because the convention managers, including Chairman Butler, ignored him and gave him no post of honor. His enthusiasm and admiration for the President remain as strong as ever.

—*New York Herald-Tribune.*

By the Way, What Has Happened to Albert B. Fall?

Found picking daisies early yesterday in Evergreens Cemetery, Brooklyn, Fred Gast, of no known address, was arrested on a charge of vagrancy and sentenced by Magistrate Rayfield of the New Jersey Avenue Court to ten days in the workhouse.

—*New York Herald-Tribune.*

Come to a Meeting if You Don't Believe It.

Today, in the United States, there is thirty times as much absolute illiteracy as in Germany and Denmark; there is twelve times as much illiteracy here as in Switzerland; six times as much as in Norway and Sweden; more than three times as much as in England, Scotland and Wales.

—*Dr. (of Dentistry) H. W. Evans, Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan.*

One Cincinnatus Who Needs No Urging.

I have come back from Greece to take the helm again if the right man is nominated.

—*Henry Morgenthau.*

No Tears in the Eighth Reel.

God help America, and especially its youth, if the time ever comes when it generally accepts the unhappy ending in its motion picture entertainment.

—*Jesse L. Lasky, Famous Players-Lasky Company.*

Deutschland unter Teapot Dome.

We should not treat our oil scandals as exceptional, and at the same time we must not condone dishonesty. What we should avoid is the danger of being stampeded by these revelations into carrying out the carefully laid plans of the Pan-German group operating in this country.

—*Mrs. Haviland H. Lund, member of the staff of Secretary Fall.*

CORRESPONDENCE

The Leopold-Loeb Case

SIR: A reader of your two articles on the Leopold-Loeb case became confused.

Insanity at the Bar of Justice was read with agreement and the feeling that a fine, deeply-human analysis had been made, and a constructive solution offered. "Let it be agreed by all parties . . . to set these defendants aside *for permanent treatment and study.*"

A wish remained—for a guess, however unsatisfying, at the tunnel leading to this firework. A few pages farther on promised that, by Crime and Publicity. But here the confusion occurred. The newspapers, the public, were on trial, redundantly to the need of this reader, for being—the newspapers, the public. Leopold is Raskolnikov or Cellini—and he is "of the privileged class. He is class-consciousness revolté ("both were romantically bored by their . . . bourgeois life," etc.) and mammon damning the public which, mammon-worshipper that it is, "does not demand (his) death." And yet the writer of Insanity at the Bar expects that "the boys will almost certainly (be sent) to the electric chair" by a public that "would rather clamor than think."

Is it not almost certainly one of the most satisfactory privileges of The New Republic to abet thought?

Dorothy B. Leonard.

Kenwood, N. Y.

SIR: You have raised an interesting point in your recent editorial on the Chicago murder case. The general rule, if I remember correctly, in murder cases is this: where insanity is offered as a defense—did the defendant know the nature and quality of his act and know that his act was wrong?

It is true as you have said that those least qualified to answer the question are the ones required to do so. I cannot agree, however, to the method you have offered for changing this condition. Judicial legislation is the bane of students of legal principles, and contrary to the principles of the American Constitution. It seems indefensible.

Workmen's compensation laws were highly desirable in the days when they were declared unconstitutional by the Court of Appeals. Mr. Roosevelt complained bitterly at the decision of the court, but I have always found it hard to believe he really wanted the court to say the law was as it was not. When the state Constitution was amended the matter was taken care of. I am heartily in favor of the compensation laws and I agree with you that our criminal system leaves much to be desired. But would it not be as well to make the necessary changes in the law by legislative action rather than to attempt to legislate in the course of the trial of an indictment for murder?

Sherman A. Hooker.

New York City, N. Y.

The La Follette Program

SIR: Your editorial entitled The La Follette Program is interesting, and makes out an excellent case for the LaFollette movement as a matter of political strategy and expediency. The assumption is, however, that government can, by "wise" or "constructive" legislation, improve the material condition of a large group of citizens. I know of nothing in experience or theory to support such an assumption. Congress and legislatures can "help" a class or group by granting subsidies, franchises and monopolies. I can think of no other way, and, therefore, find it impossible to become excited over Senator La Follette's agrarian remedies. I am satisfied that, if they were all adopted, with other conditions remaining as at present, agricultural industry would continue to fall into the hands of tenants.

I was amused by Congressman Cooper's statement, in his speech

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before the national Republican convention. In praise of Senator La Follette and his Wisconsin colleagues, Mr. Cooper declared that they had offered thirty-one propositions to Republican conventions since 1908, and that twenty-six of them had been accepted by Congress and enacted into law. I am unable to recall one of them. I have questioned well-informed citizens who ought to know, but they admit that they do not remember one of these laws.

Twenty-six La Follette ideas made into law, and still some of us are so ungrateful to him as to refuse to shout and to hail him as the Moses to lead us out of all of our political and economic distress!

It will not be by making new laws that agriculture, or, indeed, industry as a whole, will be put on a sound basis. I can see, however, that the abolition of numerous bad laws would be a great help.

HOWARD M. HOLMES.

Cleveland, O.

The Job and the Middle-Aged Woman

SIR: Thank you for publishing, and thank Mrs. Wholey for writing The Job and the Middle-Aged Woman.

Trying to think what is happiness, who is happy in just a simple, absorbing human way; the life of a busy wife and mother looks best of all human lots for about fifteen or twenty years. And those who live most completely this full experience of love and passion usually do not think of the bare future years. Nor are they trained in that brave philosophy which would, at the end of their busy years, resign them to say: "Of all life has to offer I have had the best."

Nor has there been time, granted the days and hours were happy, unconscious, and fully occupied with work for others, to prepare a place for the unoccupied twenty or thirty years still to be lived after services for the family were done. The one who does not fully step aside when the job is over is only in the way. Perhaps the next generation of women may be trained to do in the leisure of their middle-age and old age some of the jobs lying about crying for trained workers who have leisure.

In the meantime, I shall send copies of this issue of The New Republic to some of my unhapy, unoccupied middle-aged friends and trust they may find some comfort in the fact that they are surrounded by an unseen host of seekers for some adequate work for heart and hand to do.

M. B.

Nw York City, N. Y.

SIR: I noted in your correspondence column a letter signed by a "European" written in protest against Mrs. Wholey's article in your May 28th issue. I would like to take up the cudgel along with that correspondent. My interest was aroused sufficiently to make a list of most of the women with whom I am intimately in touch, and frankly I cannot discover such a hopeless state of affairs as she would make out. Of the first ten that came to mind, but two showed any sort of sign of stagnation or special discontent. Perhaps it might be of interest to enumerate what some of them are doing. One is of the extremely active sort that can never stop going—has raised a family of seven, under far from ideal circumstances, yet has managed to make time to keep up all sorts of intellectual pursuits, being the best informed woman, in general, that it has ever been my lot to meet. She is the guiding spirit of a little literary club; practically is the Red Cross chapter, dabbles in politics and social service work; runs her garden, and a few other odds and ends; and, incidentally, as you may perhaps guess, does not find a great deal of time to worry about not being able to do anything.

Another, with a family of four raised, dedicated herself to relief work during the war, particularly in France, where one of her sons was killed early in the war while serving as an ambulance driver. And her work was so well done that she was specially decorated by the French government. After the war, she continued along similar lines. A third, being forced in her forties to go to work, has obtained a position in a book store, for which work she qualifies due to her continual interest in literary work, which she has managed to keep up in spite of a life of very severe privation. A fourth continues to dedicate her life in large part to her husband, whom she has assisted tremendously in making a very unusual success of a life which seemed blighted at a very early age due to being blinded. A fifth has found time during the raising of a family of nine upon a minister's salary to devote a great deal of time to church work, and is now finishing out her life in that line and is kept very busy.

And so one might go on, but I think that those are sufficient to indicate that things are not quite so hopeless as one might imagine from Mrs. Wholey. Of course one does find conditions such as she mentions, but in very few cases that have come under my observation have the really capable mothers been for long without something worth while to do. In nearly all cases where they are at a loss, we find a mother who has been inclined to be a bit lazy, and whose children have sort of "grown-up." Any woman with any sort of gumption will develop some sort of outside interests, if only to freshen her for her household work—let alone looking forward to her later life—and I've seen it done under such discouraging circumstances that there are mighty few whom I would excuse for not developing them.

BENJAMIN DOUGLAS.

Detroit, Mich.

The Arthur Gleason Scholarships

SIR: Am enclosing herewith a resolution naming the two scholarships to Brookwood from District No. 2, United Mine Workers of America, the "Arthur Gleason Memorial Scholarships:"

"WHEREAS, Arthur Gleason, who died in Washington on December 30, 1923, by his booklet, Workers' Education, published just prior to the first National Conference on Workers' Education (1921), aided materially in giving tone and direction to that conference, and

"WHEREAS, He saw clearly before most other men had done so, the value of workers' education in America as a result of his important study of the British labor movement and the part that this education had played across the seas, and

"WHEREAS, He contributed to the cause of American workers' education in its pioneering stage by his encouragement and counsel and by magazine articles on the subject, perhaps more than any one man; Therefore,

"BE IT RESOLVED that as a tribute to his work and his memory the Executive Board of District No. 2 name the two scholarships to Brookwood from District No. 2, the Arthur Gleason Memorial Scholarships.

"Adopted June 10, 1924, at Clearfield, Pa."

JOHN BROPHY,
President.

Clearfield, Pa.

Citizenship Made Difficult

SIR: During the past few months my attention has been directed to the matter of citizenship for aliens.

I find that a large number of applicants, in every way desirable as prospective citizens, are denied citizenship on the expressed ground of the wife's presence in a foreign country. In many cases the judges tell the applicant, "Your citizen papers will be granted as soon as your wife resides with you in this country." When the applicant, however, takes steps to bring his wife to this country he is confronted by the immigration department's policy of not admitting wives of immigrants unless the latter are American citizens!

The result is anomolous. Citizenship is refused because of the wife's non-emigration to the country, and permission to emigrate is denied because of the man's non-citizenship!

Surely, a condition like this should not be permitted to continue. The judges must either grant citizenship to enable the man to bring his wife over, or the policy of the immigration department must be modified to permit of her entrance. I fully realize that the immigration department is bound by the statute recently passed by Congress; but it might be possible for the department to accept official proof of the immigrant's application for citizenship as evidence of his good faith in the matter of naturalization. Otherwise the judges must take cognizance of this condition and grant the applicant citizenship if he can offer valid evidence of his efforts to bring his wife.

I would be extremely thankful to any reader or government official if he or she would enlighten me in this matter so that I may be in a position to give counsel to the scores of applicants who come to me for assistance.

LEON A. MALKIEL.

New York City, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More Modern Art

A Primer of Modern Art, by Sheldon Cheney. New York: Boni and Liveright. $6.00.

Western Art and the New Era: An Introduction to Modern Art, by Katherine S. Dreier. New York: Brentano's. $4.00.

BOTH these introductions to modernist art have a common excellence: they are well printed and the reproductions are sufficient in number to give a good notion of the range of present-day painting. In particular, the 175 illustrations in Mr. Cheney's "primer" make it serviceable as a key and guidebook to a modern gallery; and the half-tones themselves have an unusual depth when the process and the size of the illustrations themselves are considered. It would perhaps be too much to expect the text to reach the high standard of the format and illustrations; and in neither case, to be frank, does it do so. Miss Dreier and Mr. Cheney stimulate interest and appreciation; but they do not promote a critical understanding, for their affections guide their judgment. If the fetich of academic criticism is "perspective," these authors both suffer, perhaps, from the modernist bias of distortion.

Both books labor under the handicap of addressing the more or less obtuse and uninitiated student of the modern arts. Mr. Cheney, with a sort of sly frankness, adopts the very pose of the primer. "I have chosen the primer method," he says, "because it seemed to me that what we need most, to widen appreciation of contemporary creative art is to escape for a while from High Learning and get back to a child's directness of approach." If only Mr. Cheney had carried out this fine and sensible purpose! Unfortunately, before he has gone twenty pages his feet have begun to lag in the mire of æsthetic theory: at one turn he dismisses the Renaissance, at another he introduces the notion of significant form, and all along the way he leaves a trail of white abstractions, "organization," "distortion," "interesting planes," and the rest of it—not exactly what one expects to come from the direct and naive observation of the child.

A great deal of Mr. Cheney's enthusiasm for modernist work is justified; a great many of his particular judgments are sound, and, I have no doubt, will seem sound fifty years hence. When he throws Renaissance art into the dust-heap with a shrug he is, however, betraying an æsthetic opaqueness quite as thick as that of the reader whose blindness he is trying to scale away; and when he picks his way through the entire range of contemporary painting and sculpture and architecture, labelling those who "belong" and those who don't belong, he is guilty of a sort of inverted classicism: for, after all, the modernist canon is as exclusive as a calendar of the saints which leaves out the pagan philosophers. A pure æsthetic imagination can enter into the emotional forms and images of other peoples and ages; unfortunately, Mr. Cheney does not always show such an imagination; and some of his appreciation of modernist art is plainly guided by a social interest in modern civilization. Mr. Cheney's attitude towards the Renaissance perfectly parallels the Renaissance attitude towards Gothic art; both bear the taint of apologetics.

Miss Dreier does not make this error. She prefaces her discussion of the "new era" with a rough sketch of the devlopment of painting from the Byzantine period down through the Post-Impressionists; and when she pleads for an understanding of abstractionism and expressionism because these movements represent to her our underlying spiritual reality, she recognizes that it is only the garb that has changed, and that the present tradition of painting is continuous with that of the past. Miss Dreier quotes with approval Ruskin's dictum that the artist must invent or perish. There is another saying of Ruskin's, however, which touches the core of modern art much more closely: he said that there might be a little hope for art and architecture if we could exchange *palsy for puerility*. The fundamental justification for all the striving and stretching of the modernist is that, at a great sacrifice, he has recovered the intensity and imaginative passion which the painters of the early Renaissance, for example, had achieved without the sacrifice.

A wise innocence is the key to almost every good modernist work. It is easy to confuse this quality with an interest in structure, or in physical materials, or in one's inner consciousness, or in abstract design; but these are just the accidental bequests of the age. In an entirely different milieu, with an entirely different outlook, William Blake a hundred years ago was goaded into the same rejections, and by his own exertions achieved the fresh integrity of the true creative artist. Miss Dreier misses what is valid in her own thesis when she says in her peroration: "Let him [the artist] express in new forms the rush of the aeroplane through space or the swift speeding of the forty horsepower car, the extraordinary skyscrapers as they crowd one another"—and so forth. To lose one's sense of self-possession in front of a skyscraper or an automobile is as sloppy a piece of sentimentality as Landseer ever was guilty of in the presence of a dog. The skyscraper does not need to be expressed; it is. The artists who will count most in the long run, I believe, are men like Odilon Redon, Albert Ryder, and Van Gogh who, while lacking the collective stimulus of religion, have contrived to transfix on canvas their own philosophic phantasy and vision. The expressionist who gives vent to the exacerbations of the age will seem just as hollow within a few generations as Sir Luke Fildes and his contemporaries—and for the same reason. Whether the modernist "realizes" his art depends upon whether he uses it to convey fresh insight or is carried away with it because of his imaginative poverty. Abstraction by itself reveals nothing: the empty canvas is perhaps the result of an empty head. Rembrandt better fulfills the aim of pure art when he illustrates, incident by incident, the Book of Tobit.

To go back to our books. On one point they are both promising. Neither Mr. Cheney nor Miss Dreier is content to dwell on painting and sculpture alone; for the latter more than once points out the necessity for preserving an eye for form in all the details of existence, and refers with approval to M. Marcel Duchamp's one-time exhibition of "ready-mades" which showed good form. Mr. Cheney goes further: he considers the art of the stage and architecture itself; and at times he even hints that what some of the more tectonic modernists aim at is to be accomplished only in architecture. This is good doctrine. If, as it seems to me, the paintings of some of the abstractionists like Kandinsky are fallacious

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attempts to ensnare music in space, it is also true that the highly rigid and articulated forms, like those of Brancusi and Duchamps-Villon, are at bottom attempts to express in the narrow compass of sculpture what can only come to a successful conclusion in building. Some of our modern artists who have the ability to see mechanical forms in their æsthetic relations would as architects, have the opportunity to translate their æsthetic reactions into appropriate mechanical forms. Below the highest plane of painting and sculpture, where he vies with poet and composer, the real province of the artist is in building and ornament. Lacking the qualities that would place it in the highest category, a good part of modern art does not alas! earn a place in the second province: the paintings are not *even* decoration; the sculpture is not even construction. It would not be strange if out of the present ferment architecture drew back again the crafts that it lost when the palace looted the church. Mr. Jacob Epstein and Duchamps-Villon have both pointed the way.

LEWIS MUMFORD.

Samuel Pepys

The Diary of Samuel Pepys, edited by Henry B. Wheatley. Three volumes. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $15.00.

The Soul of Samuel Pepys, by Gamaliel Bradford. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company. $3.50.

MAURICE HEWLETT has made the observation that the French have no Pepys's Diary. He might have added the note that they have no Boswell's Johnson. These two works stand out as unique products of English genius for realism, the realism of experience. In one case a subjective, in the other an objective study, they have the same authentic note of reality. Indeed we find Boswell in the way of recording the same sort of corroborative detail which flashes truth upon us from the pages of Pepys. Each is supreme in his class. When Macaulay could write that "Johnson is better known to us than any other man in history" it was because at that time Pepys's Diary had only recently been made known in the curtailed form in which Lord Braybrooke first gave it to the world. Potentially Pepys is as well known as the Johnson of Boswell. And the singular perfection of these masterpieces of autobiography and biography depends to a large extent on the personal imperfections of their authors. Undoubtedly Macaulay exaggerated for rhetorical purposes the disparity between Boswell's mind and his art, yet the words which he penned of Boswell he would have applied without hesitation to Pepys. "Everything which another man would have hidden; everything the publication of which would have made another man hang himself, was a matter of gay and clamorous exultation to his weak and diseased mind." And at all events the supremacy of Pepys in his field, like that of Boswell in his, justifies Macaulay's epigram: "Eclipse first, the rest nowhere."

In spite of the fact that Boswell's biography and Pepys's Diary are masterpieces at the expense of their authors, there is a marked difference between them in clearness of motivation. No one can have the slightest doubt as to why Boswell wrote, or how his slavish devotion to greatness put his gifts at the service of his subject, even to his own shame. On the other hand a mystery confronts us at the opening page of Pepys's Diary and grows more insistent as we read: Why did he do it? Stevenson made the ingenious conjecture that he wrote for the future Samuel Pepys, to bring back to that seasoned individual the zest of his youth. "The appeal to Samuel Pepys years hence is unmistakable." If this is true he must have trusted greatly to the patience of that later self for the deciphering of the shorthand in which the diary is written. To Dr. Garnett it is unthinkable that he intended or expected his diary with its frank, literal, humiliating revelations to be read by others. Yet it must be remembered that he did not destroy it among papers which were not fitting for other eyes to see, even when the failing of his own precluded the possibility of his reading it for himself. It is probable that the notion of a future public became associated in his mind with that of a future self and he may have laid to his soul the flattering unction that his reader would be thrown off the track by the transparent alteration of the cypher in the "roguish portions." To Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, author of English Diaries, Pepys stands out as the chief of his clan because he wrote from the purest of diaristic motives—the pleasure of the moment in recalling before sleep had dimmed the record, the experience of the day. Mr. Ponsonby implies that only such an immediate incentive could have controlled his action so perfectly that, except for a single fortnight, he never missed a day for nine years, and ran his total product up to above 3000 pages. To this Mr. Hewlett adds the suggestion, to explain Pepys's extraordinary frankness, of his romantic delight both in sin and in repentance. Probably a mixture of motives must be invoked to account for the phenomenon. It is certain that there was one person at least by whom Pepys never intended that his diary should be read—that was Mrs. Pepys.

The new edition of Mr. H. B. Wheatley's Pepys is a marvel of book making. By the use of India paper the ten volumes have been compressed into three, with easily legible pages. It is true, the aspiration toward the complete Pepys is even now not realized. First Lord Braybrooke published about half of the diaries. Then Mr. Mynors Bright got up to four-fifths. Finally Mr. Wheatley published it in full except for certain passages which he assures us could not possibly be printed. Why not? Stevenson's pointed thrusts when Mr. Mynors Bright was the offender, have still their application:

> It is no part of the duties of the editor of an established classic to decide what may or may not be tedious to the reader. As for the time honored phrase "unfit for publication," without being cynical we may regard it as the sign of a precaution more or less commercial; and we may think without being sordid, that when we purchase six huge and distressingly expensive volumes, we are entitled to be treated rather more like scholars and rather less like children.

In The Soul of Samuel Pepys, Mr. Gamaliel Bradford brings together significant quotations under several heads, illustrating Pepys's behavior in his business, his money matters, his relations toward his fellow men, his studies, his domestic morality, and his religion. It must be admitted that Mr. Bradford's method of classification does not carry us far behind the facts. Pepys's life does not lend itself to topical arrangement. Its chief quality was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its helter-skelter variety and the indiscriminate zest with which he mingled business, society, culture, religion and love, licit and illicit. To read Pepys neatly formulated in categories removes us quite from the vagrant narrative mood in which he wrote. Moreover, by this method is lost the sense of Pepys's character as a changing one, deteriorating as the age of the Restoration cut loose more boldly from the moorings of Puritanism, and particularly the chief pattern of his story which leads straight to the catastrophe of his domestic life, followed by the death of Mrs. Pepys and the close of the Diary. It may be that preoccupation with the soul of Samuel Pepys excludes from Mr. Bradford's mind specific attention to the body, but surely the chapter Pepys and His Wife gives a very inadequate idea of Pepys's relations with women in general and at large, upon which his marital life depended. If Mr. Ponsonby, who seems to have consulted the original manuscript, is correct, Mr. Wheatley's expurgations "give us a Pepys of greater refinement and modesty than was actually the case." So much the more then is Mr. Bradford's portrait deficient on the side of the flesh. The value of Mr. Bradford's book is in its detail rather than in its structure; its copious quotations from Pepys himself. And the plan is interesting as it brings to focus passages which have hitherto escaped the collector. For the rest, any method of disarming readers who are frightened at the sheer longinquity of Pepys in Wheatley's twelve hundred pages, is commendable. Mr. Bradford's adroitness in quotation as usual surpasses his skill as commentator. And as usual he is jauntily familiar with his subject and his readers. When Mr. Bradford makes a study of himself, he will probably attribute this persistent trait in style to his effort to live up to, or down from, Gamaliel.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Birds, Beasts and Flowers

Birds, Beasts and Flowers, by D. H. Lawrence. New York: Thomas Seltzer. $2.50.

D. H. LAWRENCE'S early poems were the record of a terrifically focused personality imbroiled with love and beauty. Heavy, packed almost to oppression with images conceived upon some intensest point of vision, these poems seemed to have been written out of that blood sense of which Mr. Lawrence has told us so often: that dark, unthinking stream which floods over and puts out the little scheming mind. There was little search for reason in them.

With Look! We Have Come Through! a break came. The poet, becoming sick of himself and of a world tainted wholly by his thoughts and emotions, is riven out of his old being by a passion at last greater than himself. He begins to give reasons. Men and women, he cries, in a long rhapsodic manifesto, must merge utterly in love, die in it, be slain. Yet each by some mystical process must nevertheless remain free from the other in a strict spiritual isolation. All must be fused, yet not fused. From this impasse—that it was an impasse the tortured figures of the novels seem to prove—Mr. Lawrence has turned at length.

In a novel, a book of essays, and a book of poems, published within the last year, the fusion has become less important than the escape. The poems in Birds, Beasts and Flowers, although they contain much of the old Lawrence's incredible apprehension of eye and word, have, as well, the ferocious dogmatic quality which has long since crept into his prose. They are poems that cry, implicitly, for existence to have done. They ask an isolation absolute, man's spirit to be a naked stalk, standing trembling and alone in a lush physical world. Mr. Lawrence has turned his back on humanity that strains for illusion, not identity, and gives his allegiance to beasts (if they be strong, single beasts) and to fruits of the earth.

When Mr. Lawrence left the Midlands he entered a wide and terribly various world. He went toward it with a great thirsting will to pare down beauty to its core. The prose of Twilight in Italy, the first record of these journeys, contains passages which cannot be outdone by any poem he has ever written. The seeds of the later mysticism and philosophy are there, but Mr. Lawrence was still the questioner. He still believed that in mankind there could become "ecstacy of light and dark together," "Why do we not know that the two in consummation are one, that each is only part, partial and alone forever; but that the two in consummation are perfect, beyond the range of loneliness or solitude?" Existence had not yet been divided for him, like the apple in the fairy tale, of which one side was white and sweet, the other glowing and poisoned in every grain. The reasons for Italy's beauty were secondary to the beauty itself, bright in his sentences as upon his eyes. Lately India, Australia and America have come before those eyes. But they are more tired. A tightness has bound the sight. And the world must no longer be light and dark commingled. Light or dark, singleness or merging: in a kind of despairing didacticism Mr. Lawrence shouts that the choice must be made.

With America he has quarreled because she does not make the choice. Both Whitman and his country are flawed by the same weakness. In Studies in Classic American Literature Mr. Lawrence has smashed down one of his own idols—the poet, who in 1920 was to him the master of "the unrestful, ungraspable poetry of the sheer moment—life surging into utterance at its very well head." It is Whitman's philosophy that concerns him now. "Whitman said sympathy. If only he had stuck to it. Because sympathy means feeling with, not feeling for. He kept on having a passionate feeling for the Negro slave . . . which is merging." In Birds, Beasts and Flowers America comes under the same lash:

> You who in loving break down
> And break further and further down
> Your bounds of isolation,
> But who never rise, resurrected, from this grave of mingling,
> In a new proud singleness, America.

Demos—"demon too"—is the madness by which Mr. Lawrence will never be possessed. He watches Socialists in yellow boots, on Italian Sundays, decked with hibiscus and salvia, and denies them equality with himself and the flowers:

> Never
> To be a Bolshevist
> With a hibiscus flower behind my ear
> In sign of life, of lovely dangerous life,
> And passionate disquality of men.

He wants the world burned and beaten down, but not by them. And though he seek out in escape an ancient equivocal fern world, where perhaps the grape was the rose, or a world withered with lava, or even plunging be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neath the ground, "the winding, leaf-clogged, silent lanes of hell," yet the spell upon him of this earth is not quite dissolved. The almond-tree flowers out from iron branches; there is still kingly fruit and flower—pomegranates:

> O crown of spiked metal
> Actually growing!

But the spell of love is dissolved. Those who once found in Lawrence a passionate clairvoyance into love, need not look for it here. To the integrated individual, love is not important. But Mr. Lawrence cannot yet state his thesis calmly. There is something slightly hysterical in his railing against the lusts of goats, the love-gluttedness of the little hairless Mexican bitch. He is more calm with his proud beasts. Snake, the drama between a serpent and a man who sees it shouldering down into its secret kingdom, is one of the fine poems in the book. The mountain-lion, the eagle, the turkey-cock, the fish—rocked in a cold element "without love"—are each beautifully struck from the old power. And Mr. Lawrence has allowed Medlars and Sorb-Apples—after breaking it with two perversely flippant lines—to be a poem. It is soaked in the rotten-ripe scent of autumn, and chilled by separation's cold anguish. In it nothing is proven concerning isolation. It is isolation: "the intoxication of final loneliness."

Though Mr. Lawrence continue to write poems with corrections within them, poems in which deliberate inanity is set beside phrases which almost shock the mind with their perception, though he deny every human emotion in the world, he will never quite succeed in denying himself. The essential genius must remain, under the invective and didacticism, that perhaps have become necessary as defense in this personality, at every point asking the essence, or else surcease, oblivion—at every point refused.

LOUISE BOGAN.

Some Recent Novels

The Avalanche, by Ernest Poole. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.00.

DESPITE its sincerity, and despite figures, scenes and a problem all potentially significant, Mr. Poole's new novel leaves one with a disappointed sense of detachment. The elements of a compelling story are there, but they remain lifeless and remote. Perhaps it is because the hero, half mystic, half scientist, is at times a little less, at times a little more than human. Perhaps it is because the texture of the plot is too thin to support the weight of such a hero. In any case, one perceives rather than feels these people, and the perception will leave many readers cold and unbelieving.

Llewelyn Dorr, the hero, is a young neurologist interested not only in exploring those who are "all or partly mad," but also in pushing his little circle of light into the dark world of various psychic phenomena. Into his quiet but spiritually tense and exciting life comes a post-war society girl of New York, hard, restless, eager for something different. He marries her, for reasons none too credible, and when her desire to help him and her ambitions for his career express themselves in the only way they can, through her sense of publicity, she succeeds, notwithstanding the best of intentions, not only in destroying the tranquillity essential to his researches, but in wrecking the man himself.

Unfortunately, the efforts involved in making Llewlyn Dorr plausible—in suggesting his mysterious powers and mystical ideas, in indicating the various kinds of mental healer that he is not—are too obvious and too time-consuming. They halt the action in the first part of the book, interfere with the development of the central conflict, and are not sufficiently successful to compensate for so much lost motion. Thus a theme calculated to appeal to the large public periodically captured by miracle men of all shades of authenticity will hardly awaken much enthusiasm in its present setting. To the confirmed intellectualist, the hero will be merely a blur and a bore.

G. F.

Imperturbe, by Elliot Paul. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.50.

MR. PAUL has written three novels, each titled with one word beginning with a capital I—Indelible, Impromptu, and now Imperturbe. The letter I, too, typifies them pretty thoroughly, since each presents a highly individualized personality or pair of personalities seen from a merciless single point of view.

The great hope for Mr. Paul is just that. He arises definitely as a personality, a young man with actually something to say. In Indelible he said it about music and the career of a young composer; in Impromptu he tackled the war as it affected a soldier and a prostitute; in Imperturbe, seeking to grasp within the limits of a novel all the essential facts of a life, he goes further.

He perhaps goes too far. Imperturbe does not live up to its title. The hero, Lester Davis, is presented as a promising young man, who, contracting syphilis, goes through a rack of torture and emerges, we are given rather uncertainly to understand, unscathed. But he is not imperturbable. His struggles have none of that pathos which comes when real strength submits. Mr. Paul evidently sought to show just what the effects of disease might be on a character of his choice; but his story misses fire on account of the essential weakness and smallness of that character.

Imperturbe is brilliantly written. The earlier sections dealing with Lester's life in the sagebrush country, have a positive glamor. But the end of the book suffers from a progressive disorganization remotely analogous, perhaps, to the effects of the disease itself on the hero.

Imperturbe marks little advance on Mr. Paul's earlier novels. Much of it must impress even a casual reader, not as fiction, but as a feat of memory.

J. G.

Henry Brocken, by Walter de la Mare. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.00.

ONE finds that Henry Brocken rides forth on Rosinante out of a March morning into a midsummer dawn, and meets a child "walking with slow insistent step" across a solitary moor. He asks her her name. "They call me Lucy Gray," she replied, looking up into his face. He adds, "I think my heart almost ceased to beat." For a moment the reader is likely to stare across the book with envisioned eyes as at an impossibility come true, without a sound but maybe a sigh of mingled awe and incredulity, before following whithersoever Henry

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brocken will lead in his travels in the "rich, strange, scarce-imaginable regions of romance." Henry Brocken meets Mrs. Rochester—"Jane Eyre, you know;" approaches a glade "so green and tranquil" that he knows it for the Garden of the Hesperides, and there sups and talks with Julia and Electra and Anthea and Dianeme, sups on cherries and talks of Robin Herrick. Past the Forest of Arden Beauty lies sleeping in her unpenetrated, impenetrable castle; past the desperate land of the Houynmnms is the Inn at the World's End, Pliant and Malice and Liveloose and talk of Christian. Mr. de la Mare makes them live, gives to their slightly dimmed immortality a new brightness, a new glamor. But the familiar figures he shadows forth, the airy intangibilities to which he gives names and habitations form only half of the enchantment. The other half exists in his liquid prose phrasing packed with reminiscence:

> Pilot baying at I know not what light minions of the moon . . . Dawn lingered in the shadows as snow when winter is over and gone . . . While the leafy fringes of the sky glowed yet with changing fires . . . Victors over time and outrageous fortune . . . Through what sad labyrinths we, who dream not so wildly, cannot by taking thought come to guess . . . Low on the sky's moonlit border Venus excellently bright . . . Stilling the sea with the cold dews of night . . . This also was an island in a sea of shadows.

He has set prose of his working with gems of other men's cutting, Shakespeare's, Milton's, Jonson's, the antique style of the Bible, and other fashioning, vaguely unrecognizable. In Henry Brocken Mr. de la Mare has been able to follow Bottom's mysterious counsel: he has found out moonshine.

H. G.

The Parson's Progress, by Compton Mackenzie. New York: George H. Doran Company. $2.50.

IN the worshipful history of the pale young curate Mark Lidderdale who has already ascended the Altar Steps and now gains a Parson's Progress, Mr. Compton Mackenzie seeks to conjure up the lost luminous glory of Carnival and Youth's Encounter and succeeds in achieving a very creditable imitation of the early style of Mr. Compton Mackenzie. The sun of Mr. Mackenzie's once splendid prose appears to have set in an illusory twilight through whose dim perspectives the young curate moves like a ghost to his mysterious atonement. Perhaps Michael Fane never did wear the aspect of a reality more solid than the folding investiture of fine words; but at least the words were set to an orchestral commentary haunting in studied grace and the leisure of calculated rhythms. Michael Fane was never up to much of anything save Mr. Mackenzie's sonorous rediscovery of Latin prose turned into English. He was, however, so girdled round with beauty that one was content with the rhythm of words rather than the bitter press of life, and the music at its best swelled to a rich complexity.

Two novels made up of rhythm rather than substance Mr. Mackenzie expanded into the arid competence of Sylvia Scarlett wherein Michael came back as a lost angel stripped of glamor. Then in a vow of regrettable assiduity Mr. Mackenzie apparently decided to begin all over again and start Michael afresh in Mark Lidderdale. The manner and method unroll again in a tepid and insubstantial narrative vivid in echoes of a past splendor and rich in promises of deliquescence in the third volume announced as the Heavenly Ladder. Mark Lidderdale hardly needs to follow the volumes in the accepted order. Already he has climbed the ladder into heaven for despite Mr. Mackenzie's utmost striving he has never lived on earth. Mr. Mackenzie himself is now a memory of a once almost miraculous promise. Even in the first wonderful pages of Youth's Encounter, however, the more sober-minded probably detected the inner hollowness of the so brightly glowing heart.

A. D. D.

There Is Confusion, by Jessie Fauset. New York: Boni and Liveright. $2.00.

THIS novel is significant because it is the first work of fiction to come from the pen of a colored woman in these United States. It is evidence that we can with assurance look forward in the near future to having our fiction dealing with life among the Negroes written by the Negroes themselves. And this is as it should be. Long the object of burlesque and pitiless satire, it is natural that the Negro in his upward plunge should want to strike back, to write out of his own rich and varied experience, not for the delectation of the whites, but for the edification and enjoyment of his own people.

The mushroom growth of magazines published by the Negroes and the fiction to be found in them, the serialization of stories of obscure colored authors in Negro newspapers, the establishment, even, of reputable Negro publishing houses—all point to this new, up and pushing spirit.

Having as its motif the futility that must not arrest the conquering progress of the Negroes, Miss Fauset's book, however, is not really "younger generation Negro" stuff. Toomer's insouciant "Cane" in this respect is miles beyond it. Indeed, it is a sort of bridge between the old and the new Negro generations. For the literature of these strident neophytes is of a shockingly esoteric nature—full of beauty and passion and blackly steering clear of the inferiority complex. Mediocre, a work of puny, painstaking labor, There Is Confusion, is not meant for people who know anything about the Negro and his problems. It is aimed with unpardonable naïvete at the very young or the pertinently old.

E. D. W.

Contributors

WILLIAM E. BORAH, United States Senator from Idaho, the distinguished Republican progressive leader, was admitted to the bar in 1889, and has practised law in Kansas and Idaho.

DONALD R. RICHBERG is a member of the bar of Illinois and practises law in Chicago, where he is closely associated with liberal political movements. He is the author of A Man of Purpose.

LEONARD CLINE is on the staff of the New York World, and a contributor to The Nation, The American Mercury, The Midland and other magazines.

LEWIS MUMFORD is the author of The Story of the Utopias. His most recent book is Sticks and Stones: An Interpretation of American Architecture and Civilization.

LOUISE BOGAN, who contributes verse to current magazines, is the author of a book of poems called Body of This Death.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED